In The Matter Of:

BROOKLINE ZONING BOARD APPEALS HEARING

APPEALS HEARING - Vol. VI May 8, 2014

MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

225 Varick Street 10th Floor New York, NY 10017 Phone: 212.557.7400 Fax: 212.692.9171

Volume VI

Pages 1-119

Brookline Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing

Case Number 20130094

40B Application by Chestnut Hill Realty

The Residences of South Brookline

May 8, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Office of Town Counsel

333 Washington Street, 6th floor

Brookline, Massachusetts 02445

Reporter: Barbara J. Vican

```
1
                      APPEARANCES
 2
      Board Members:
        Jesse Geller, Chairman
        Jonathan Book
 5
        Christopher Hussey
        Mark Zuroff, Associate Member
 6
        Avi Liss, Associate Member
 9
      Samuel Nagler, Esquire
10
        Krokidas & Bluestein
11
      Edith M. Netter, Esquire
12
        Edith M. Netter & Associates, P.C.
      Alison C. Steinfeld
13
14
        Planning & Community Development Director
15
      Brian J. Beisel, P.E. BETA
      Robert J. Michaud, P.E.
16
17
        MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc.
      Robert Ward, Chief of Operations
18
19
        Brookline Fire Department
20
      Marc Levin, Chestnut Hill Realty
21
      Ken Goldstein, Member of the Board of Selectmen
22
      Regina Frawley, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 16
23
      William Varol, 45 Asheville Road
24
      Steven Krug, 237 Russett Road
```

```
APPEARANCES - Continued
 1
      Steve Chiumenti, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 16
 2
      Jay Talerman, Esquire Blatman, Bobrowski & Mead
      Irene Scharf, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 16
 5
      Joni Burstein, South Street resident
 6
      Robin Koocher, Beverly Road resident
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 7:06 p.m. MR. GELLER: Good evening, everyone. We are going to open our hearing. This is a continuation of 5 hearings involving the Residences of South Brookline. My name is Jesse Geller. To my immediate left is Mark 6 Zuroff; next to him is Chris Hussey, Jonathan Book, 8 and Avi Liss. As people may recall, this evening is an opportunity to revisit issues that pertain to 10 11 traffic. I have a few announcements that I would like 12 to make before we get started. 13 The first is later in this hearing will be an 14 opportunity for the public to speak. Anyone who 15 wishes to speak, I would ask you again, start by giving us your name, and, please, if you do wish to 16 17 speak, speak into the microphone at the podium. 18 The Town and the applicant have agreed to a one-month extension of the public hearing so that the 19 20 hearings, the outside date is now August 14th of 21 2014. This is to give the parties an opportunity to 22 further discuss the various issues. I'll now call 23 upon Alison Steinfeld to give us an update of the 24 sessions.

1 MS. STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Alison 2 Steinfeld, planning director. Staff representing the Building and Planning Departments and Town Counsel's office continue to meet 5 with Chestnut Hill Realty. Discussion has focused on the amount of green space; the number, size and 6 placement of units; the amount of parking; and the 8 size of the large apartment building. The applicant may present an alternative site plan at the next 10 meeting. Thank you. 11 MR. GELLER: Thank you. As mentioned, tonight's 12 hearing will be dedicated to issues pertaining to 13 traffic, and the hearing will be in the following 14 order. 1.5 We will first hear a presentation of the final 16 reports, and I understand this is going to be done on 17 a question-by-question basis. If people recall, there 18 were a number of questions that were raised both by 19 the ZBA's peer reviewer, which is BETA, as well as by 20 town departments and also by the public. So I think 21 for coherence sake, these topics will be handled on a 22 question-by-question basis in which we will first hear 23 from the applicant's expert and then we'll have a 24 response from BETA.

Once that concludes, there will then be an 1 2 opportunity for the Board to ask any additional questions it may have or remaining questions it may have, though you may all feel compelled to just blurt 5 out a question in the middle of the responser. You certainly are free to do that. 6 We will then hear from the public, and we'll take some further input from the public based upon what we have heard, and I would ask people to please listen to what other people are asking and what other people are 10 11 saying. It may help you to concentrate the questions you have. It may, in fact, lead you to further 12 13 questions. 14 MR. BOOK: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. So the 15 public, their questions are to be confined to traffic? MR. GELLER: Traffic, correct. Tonight is 16 17 focused on traffic. Thank you. 18 MR. BOOK: Okay. 19 MR. GELLER: Who is here to speak on behalf of 20 the applicant? 21 And actually, before you get started, why don't 22 you introduce each of yourselves. 23 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of MR. MICHAUD: 24 the Board. For the record, my name is Robert Michaud,

a managing principal of MDM Transportation Consultants 1 2 based in Marlborough, Massachusetts. We're the traffic consultant for the applicant. MR. BEISEL: Good evening, everyone. Brian 5 Beisel from BETA Group, and I'm a senior project engineer. I apologize for not being here in March. 6 was at a preplanned family vacation. I'm here as the ZBA's and the Town's traffic engineering consultant. MR. MICHAUD: As a matter of protocol, we've 10 coordinated with BETA on our responses. We've 11 submitted written responses to their document of 12 March -- their peer review document of March 20th, and 13 as the Board may recall, there were additional 14 comments made at the March 26th ZBA hearing by BETA. 15 As a matter of providing a comprehensive response, 16 we've actually combined both the written comments from 17 March 20th and the verbal discussion points that were 18 made at that hearing into our response. So what I'd like to do is actually take each of 19 20 the comments point by point with the overview that we 21 have actually reached agreement or concurrence with 22 BETA on each of the points that were raised. As the 23 Board may recall, the peer review from later in March 24 identified that the methodologies employed in the

traffic report were, in fact, consistent with industry 1 2 practices and protocols. By and large, there weren't really any points of disagreement or open issues. However, there was a request at the subsequent 5 hearing March 26th to provide supplemental information that would augment that presented in the report, 6 specifically relating to the neighborhood itself, so 8 we'll step through these on a point-by-point basis, and to the extent BETA wishes to corroborate or add comment, Brian will be right next to the podium to do 10 11 that. 12 So the first comment relates to the study area 13 which in the peer review comment was deemed to be 14 appropriate for evaluating the impacts of the project, 15 and as indicated those were the green dots on this map which included the signalized locations at 16 17 Independence Drive, the driveways serving the property at multiple locations on Independence Drive, and then, 18 of course, the Asheville Road intersections itself and 19 20 at Russett. 21 On March 26, the applicants -- the Town's 22 engineer had suggested that we also look at the 23 orange-dot areas which are representative of the local 24 neighborhood street systems of Russett Road, South

Street, and Bonad Street, as well as Beverly Road 1 2 which, as many are aware, connects to the Baker School. We've also had the opportunity to look at additional supplemental data right on Independence. 5 So we've conducted that for really two reasons. One is to understand the baseline traffic and speed 6 conditions that exist within those neighborhood streets, and secondly, to corroborate or confirm the growth rate assumptions that were employed in the 10 traffic study. 11 The 2014 data that was presented in our response was collected on Independence Drive at the identical 12 13 location from years past prior-collected data, and 14 when you compare those data -- really it was 2007 to 1.5 2014 -- the effective growth rate over that time 16 period is less than half of a percent. Our traffic 17 report uses an annual equivalent 1 percent growth 18 factor, so we've been factoring conservative in the means with which we've evaluated future-year growth 19 20 conditions. 21 We also note that if you look at specific 22 intersections at South Street, for instance, the Town 23 has studied those locations as part of the upgraded 24 signal systems there in the mid 2000s. We went back

out and manually counted those same locations again to 1 2 compare the growth trends, and those growth trends show to be about a quarter percent per year in total entering volume. 5 So in both counts, the information that we've presented in our traffic report is, in fact, based on 6 a conservative assumption of growth and is therefore valid. There's some tables and charts that support those findings. For instance, this is the manual 10 counts that compare the data used in the 2013 traffic 11 report to data collected by the Town in 2004 for 12 improvements at those locations showing that we're 13 essentially very stable to flat growth over that 14 7-year period. 1.5 The third point -- and this relates to the 16 supplemental data collection again -- has to do with 17 travel speeds on Independence Drive. BETA has requested that those be quantified. I know it was a 18 point of discussion or comment by the police 19 20 department, and in the vein of identifying what the 21 actual speeds are, this factors into the improvements 22 that we intend for Independence Drive, the traffic 23 calming measures that we'll describe later. 24 The posted regulatory speed limit on Independence

Drive is 35 miles an hour. Mechanically collected 1 2 data over a multiday period indicates that the average or mean travel speed on Independence Drive is highly consistent with those posted regulatory limits. In 5 the northbound direction, it's 34; in the southbound, it's 30. If you look at the high end of the range, what we'll call the 85th percentile travel speeds -the speeds at which 85 percent of the traveling population travels at or below -- that speed range is 39 miles an hour northbound, slightly more than the 10 11 regulatory limit, and 35 miles an hour southbound, 12 identical to the posted limit. 13 The 85th percentile speed is typically the speed 14 that an engineering department or municipality or the 1.5 state would use as the basis for establishing a speed 16 zone, meaning what should be the posted speed limit, 17 so the find here is that the existing posted limits 18 are, in fact, consistent with those speeds. 19 The fourth comment had to do with identifying 20 site-line requirements at proposed driveways so that 21 they would demonstrate compliance with the 85th percentile measured speeds, and happily so, they do. 22 23 The site lines that are provided at proposed 24 intersections along Independence Drive exceed 500 feet

and exceed the requirements even on the basis of 85th 1 2 percentile measured speed. The fifth point is really an on-site design issue. It had to do with comments on ensuring that 5 site lines would be adequate and unimpaired at the garage entrance points within the property. 6 specific design is subject to ongoing review with BETA. It's part of a site plan and drainage design review, and it's really not something that we're 10 intending to provide or elaborate on this evening in 11 this forum. That's really a site plan issue, but that 12 will be resolved under that process. 13 The sixth comment had to do with police 14 department records and request to obtain local data to 15 ensure that what was presented in the traffic report 16 was consistent. The traffic report relies upon data 17 provided by the MassDOT that originates from the Registry of Motor Vehicles. That data as originally 18 presented in this study indicated that there's a 19 20 relatively low crash incidence in the study area, 21 meaning when one looks at the crash rate and compares 22 it to a statewide or districtwide average, we 23 demonstrated that the actual rates are well below 24 average.

The local records corroborate that. They're 1 2 highly consistent with the DOT data, and we have not identified any specific locations that would suggest the need for safety countermeasures. This is the 5 graphical depiction of that information which we obtained from the local police for the period of 2011, 6 '12 and '13 color coded by year, and you'll see that the crashes over that three-year period are pretty well dispersed along Independence Drive. There's some outlyers here; beyond the Baker School, there's a 10 11 couple of incidents. I believe one of them had to do 12 with a vehicle malfunction, but, by and large, there 13 isn't any specific location you'd say there's a crash 14 hotspot. 1.5 When you look at, in more detail, the crash rates 16 for the individual intersections along Independence 17 Drive, you'll see that the crash rate is about .12 or 18 less. That is compared against a statewide average of .58, so it's about 3 times lower than average. 19 20 It's not -- nothing is indicating or suggesting the 21 need for countermeasures. Here's the actual data: 14 crashes over that 22 23 3-year period, 3 of which in some form involved 24 pedestrian activity, and that becomes a valid point of

information as we consider improvements to 1 2 Independence Drive that will not only enhance safety for traveling for folks using the roadway, bicyclists for instance, but also for pedestrians that are 5 crossing it. The seventh comment had to do with trip generation estimates, and we've concurred -- BETA has concurred with us -- that the rates used in the traffic report are, in fact, appropriate. They're based on a suburban standard and do not take credit 10 11 for the likelihood that folks will use some form of 12 non-single-occupant vehicle for to and from the site. 13 What that means is when you look at census data for 14 the area, we know that there's a relatively high 1.5 percentage of people who will either walk, bike, take the shuttle, or, in some instances, use the MBTA bus. 16 17 We haven't taken credit for that. We've used an unadjusted suburban standard which BETA has found to 18 19 be appropriate. No further response required. 20 Eight, traffic calming. The basis of the 21 presentation on March 26, the request for supplemental 22 data, really had its genesis in trying to identify an 23 existing baseline of volumes and speeds in local 24 neighborhood streets, and that would allow an

evaluation of whether or not additional traffic 1 2 calming measures would be appropriate for that neighborhood to address if, for instance, there was a speeding issue or there was a high crash location or 5 there were higher than normal volumes or conditions that would suggest the need for those types of 6 measures. Beyond those particular neighborhood streets, we know that there are also initiatives that would probably make sense on Independence Drive, and 10 we'll talk about those momentarily. 11 What MDM has done is to look at each of the 12 neighborhood streets that were identified by BETA. 13 We've inventoried the existing features of those 14 neighborhood streets. You'll see in this diagram that 1.5 we've looked at the sidewalk systems that are shown in 16 dashed orange annotation. There's a comprehensive and 17 consistent system of sidewalks that exist in that 18 entire neighborhood setting. There are already traffic calming elements in place that were provided 19 20 by the Town over the past years. 21 For instance, the chicane element, the mini-22 roundabout of sorts I guess you'd call it, on South 23 That's a traffic calming element intended to Street. 24 slow traffic down and to control it at that particular

1 location. 2 At other locations, at Russett Road, Bonad, and South, you'll see that there are a series of four-way or all-way stops. That is yet another type or form of 5 traffic calming that requires drivers to come to a complete stop and then proceed. The only location 6 where that type of measure is not currently provided is at Asheville and Russett, at that location. So the context of this neighborhood suggests that many of the elements that you would consider for 10 11 traffic calming are already in place with the 12 exception of that one location. That said, we've also looked at the speed 13 14 characteristics. These speed characteristics were 1.5 measured using radar-recorder equipment over a minimum 16 24-hour period to capture speed characteristics during 17 peak hours, nonpeak hours, nighttime, morning, midday, 18 and over the course of an entire day on average. 19 What's presented here is a snapshot of those 20 results for each of the streets that BETA has asked 21 that we examine. So Russett Road, for instance, these 22 are all 30-mile-an-hour local roadways, and that's the 23 regulatory speed limit. 24 If you look at Russett Road, the 85th percentile

speeds for Russett Road vary from 21 to 23 miles per 1 2 They're well below the regulatory posted speed limit there. Bonad Street, 28 to 27, slightly higher but still reasonably below the posted regulatory 5 limit. Asheville Road, 20 to 21 miles an hour. This is the component that really provides existing access 6 to Hancock Village. If you look at South Street which has a higher posted limit of 35, its 85th percentile speeds are exactly consistent with the posted regulatory limits, 34 to 35. Beverly Road, 30-mile-10 11 an-hour road, has 85th ranging from 27 to 29. 12 So we're not seeing any aspect of measured speeds 13 that are inconsistent with posted limits on 14 neighborhood streets that would suggest the need for 1.5 some form of control. 16 From a volume perspective, we've also used 17 mechanical equipment to collect hourly and daily traffic volumes on neighborhood streets at those same 18 locations. No surprise that Bonad and Russett are 19 20 very low volume local roadways, less than 500 vehicle 21 trips per day. I think the hourly numbers on that are 22 about 60 vehicles per hour. South Street is actually a collector/distributor road. It has a higher volume 23 24 of just under 2,700 trips over the course of a day.

- 1 Beverly Road, which provides a connection to Baker, at
- 2 1,600 per day; and of course Independence at almost
- 3 14,000.
- 4 This provides a context to understand that the
- 5 local roadway traffic volumes are, in fact, low volume
- 6 streets, and, based on the assessment of the traffic
- 7 report, will remain low volume streets even with the
- 8 development in place.
- 9 The conclusion of that is that we don't believe
- 10 that, on the basis of the lack of crash experience,
- 11 low volume traffic conditions, the presence of
- 12 existing traffic calming elements, and the relatively
- 13 low travel speeds, speeds that are consistent with
- 14 regulatory limits, that any additional measures are
- 15 warranted within the neighborhood street system.
- 16 Comment 9. There was a question that related to
- 17 clarifying trip distribution assumptions in specific
- 18 traffic volume increases in local neighborhood
- 19 streets. We've essentially developed a clarifying
- graphic that would indicate for each component of the
- 21 project how many trips are being generated using the
- 22 suburban trip rate and how they get assigned to the
- 23 roads.
- This is the Independence Drive quarter going to

the north. This is the Russett Road connection, 1 2 Bonad, South. This is the highest concentration of residential units which would be accessed by Asheville Road. At the highest concentration of units, that 5 connection through the neighborhood streets shows increases of -- in the weekday morning peak hour 6 condition -- about 34 vehicle trips or less on many of these streets. If you look at Russett Road between Asheville and VFW Parkway, for instance, 22-vehicle increase over 10 11 the course of an hour is predicted. As you go toward Independence, it's 34, and it's 1 vehicle every 2 12 minutes. That's the average increase. South Street 13 14 is smaller. You look at Beverly Road, it's only 5. 1.5 You look at Independence Drive south of Thornton, 9. 16 Fairly inconsequential numbers and similar for 17 weekday p.m. peak hour periods. So we've provided this information. It shows 18 that while there may be some variability in local 19 20 distribution patterns, this provides a pretty good 21 sense as to what that level of increase is. It will 22 not have a material effect on your ability to travel 23 on these roads. There's ample capacity, and the 24 documented speed conditions suggest that there really

```
aren't any other measures that need to be in place.
 1
 2
           Capacity analysis, BETA has indicated, was done
      in accordance with industry standards and is, in fact,
      valid using the volumes that we've just described as
 5
      being -- relying on a 1 percent annual growth rate, so
      we've used a conservative assumption. As I've stated
      in prior testimony, the Level of Service analysis, the
      capacity analysis shows that in every instance there
      is no -- literally no change in operating level from a
      no-build condition to a build condition as a result of
10
11
      this project. There are no locations anywhere here
12
      that operate at Level of Service E or F. They're all
      well below capacity, Level of Service A, B, C, and, in
13
14
      some cases, D which relates to the left-turn movement
1.5
      from Gerry Road onto Independence; but you'll see that
16
      all of the public ways and streets here operate at
17
      Level of Service A, B, or C with no change as a result
18
      of the project.
           Their comment regarding trip distribution also
19
20
      made note of the fact that there are multiple access
21
      points that are provided that help disperse that
22
      impact over a number of local roadway streets, two of
23
      those driveways along Independence and one at
24
      Asheville; and we've recapped that at no location on
```

any street are we anticipating an increase that would 1 2 change the character, nature, or operating conditions of those roads. Number 12. The BETA comment suggested the need 5 to expand the TDM program. TDM, of course, stands for Transportation Demand Management. The idea behind TDM 6 is to get people out of their cars, to use other forms of transportation, or to perhaps carpool or do things of this nature. So as originally proposed, Hancock 10 Village currently operates a shuttle service. 11 very well-utilized service. Under this application, 12 that shuttle service would be expanded based on demonstrated demand and need. 13 14 Second, the application will include the 15 provision of secure bicycle-storage facilities and 16 racks throughout the development. 17 Third, there is a substantial integrated system of sidewalks that will be provided that not only 18 connect to the existing sidewalk system within Hancock 19 20 Village, but also provide a continuous connection to 21 public sidewalk systems that lead to destinations like the Baker School, for instance. 22 23 And fourth, this really is to the Zipcar 24 There is currently Zipcar service that is service.

provided with, I believe, two Zipcar parking positions 1 2 and vehicles. The applicant has reached out already to Zipcar to understand to what extent that could be expanded. Zipcar evaluates the need for that each 5 spring, and so the applicant, on an annual basis, is willing to discuss the idea of expanding Zipcar 6 capability and supply each spring to the extent that it's warranted. Comment 13. The Russett Road/Asheville Road 10 intersection, as I mentioned earlier, is under stop 11 control only for the Asheville approach. We've 12 evaluated based on objective criteria whether or not a 13 warrant would be met for installation of an all-way 14 stop control at that one location. The Manual on 1.5 Uniform Traffic Control Devices, MUTCD, provides 16 specific volume-based criteria that must be considered 17 before implementing that type of control. When we 18 look at those criteria, the volumes simply aren't high enough to warrant that form of control at that 19 20 particular location, nor, in our opinion, would the 21 volume conditions be met in many of the locations in 22 the neighborhood where all-way stop control is 23 currently provided. 24 That said, there may be other conditions that

would indicate the need for that form of control that 1 2 are not volume based. They're a little more subjective and perhaps the reason that the Town has opted to implement that at other locations. 5 applicant is very much willing to work with the Town to fund and implement an all-way stop control to the 6 extent the Town deemed it appropriate at Asheville and Russett. Comment 14, traffic calming measures. We've discussed the data that relates to the local 10 11 neighborhood street system. We don't believe that 12 there are any supplemental or additional measures that 13 are needed beyond the all-way stop control, for 14 instance, which in and of itself could be a traffic 15 calming element. 16 Traffic calming really is most appropriately 17 focused on Independence Drive based on our survey of pedestrian activity, slightly above average travel 18 speeds, crash experience, and other factors. And so 19 20 we have been commissioned by the applicant, by the 21 proponent, to prepare a conceptual plan that would 22 indicate those types of features for Independence 23 Drive. 24 This diagram shows the context of the

improvements that are very -- 20,000-foot level, so 1 2 let me zoom in on this to better describe what's being proposed here. This intersection happens to be the intersection of Sherman at Thornton with 5 Independence. This is the busiest volume location 6 along this stretch of road. It currently has pedestrian crossing from one edge to the other that is just under 50 feet long. It's a rather long crossing. It's also a location where a documented 10 crash experience does exist as it relates to 11 pedestrians. 12 So the notion here is to provide curb bump-outs 13 that would formalize parking along the edge of the 14 road and would also, at the same time, allow for a 1.5 much shorter crossing and a more prominent crossing 16 for pedestrians. This crossing length goes from just 17 under 50 feet to 38 feet and could be augmented with some form of traffic control that we'll speak to in a 18 moment known as either flashing beacons that are push-19 20 button controlled, or motion-activated or hawk-type 21 beacons which would require vehicles to physically 22 stop when a button is pushed. 23 So there's two forms of control that could be 24 used, and either one of those forms of control would

provide much more prominent visibility to pedestrians 1 2 and pedestrian activity by motorists. You'll also notice that in addition to formalizing the parking on the curb edges and 5 shortening the crosswalk that there are bicycle lanes provided on each side of the road. 6 So taken together, all of these elements would meet the objectives of a design philosophy known as Complete Streets, designing facilities that would accommodate not only the needs of vehicular flow, but 10 11 flow of nonmotorized modes of transportation whether they're by bicycle or foot. So that's what the 12 13 applicant has developed conceptually for the quarter. 14 As you focus further north at the proposed east 1.5 driveway here just north of Gerry Road, a west 16 driveway here, the Beverly Road signal here, that same 17 cross section would continue with curb bump-outs at 18 the east driveway. Again, the shortened crossing; again, the either flashing beacons or HAWK-type beacon 19 20 control at that location. And you'll see that there's 21 a transition that brings that cross section back to 22 the four-lane section that currently exists at the 23 signal at Beverly Road. So there's a nice easy 24 transition from that single lane back to a two-lane

- 1 section as you approach the signal; and likewise, if
- 2 you're traveling through the signal, you'd have a nice
- gentle transition back to a single lane with proper
- 4 transitions, curb, to get you to that driving
- 5 position.
- 6 So this type of design is not only compliant with
- 7 Complete Street's philosophy and standards, but would
- 8 actually provide a more coherent driving experience
- 9 for folks who are not familiar with the area. Today
- it's not uncommon for people who are traveling in the
- outer lane, the curbside lane, to realize once they've
- 12 gotten through the signal that, gee, there's someone
- 13 parked there, and I need to quickly get over to the
- 14 center lane. This eliminates that confusion and
- 15 conflict.
- 16 Finally, there's an existing crosswalk at Beverly
- 17 Road which is somewhat askew. It actually results in
- 18 a very long crossing that's in excess of 50 feet.
- 19 This is the crossing that you would use to get to the
- 20 Baker School. This concept would have that crosswalk
- 21 realigned so that it was at a 90-degree alignment.
- 22 Shortens it up quite a bit, and it would enhance
- 23 safety.
- 24 So taken in combination, this is what BETA had

suggested might be appropriate for the quarter. 1 2 developed this concept. It's certainly not an engineering-level design drawing, but it really provides a framework for continued discussion with the 5 Town on implementing something that makes sense and that is warranted. 6 This is an example of a street where this has actually been implemented within the past few years. This is a MassDOT funded project. You'll see that there's a bicycle lane here with curb bump-outs from 10 11 side streets, formalized curbside parking, single 12 travel lanes in either direction, prominent crosswalks 13 which are of a brick color in this particular 14 example. So this is a good snapshot of what we're 1.5 suggesting makes sense for Independence Drive. As it relates to traffic controls, BETA wanted to 16 17 ensure that a full signal was not warranted, so we've done, using MUTCD criteria, a signal-warrant analysis 18 for full-signal control both at Gerry Road and at 19 20 Thornton/Sherman, and the volume conditions simply 21 don't warrant full-signal control. The volumes just 22 aren't there. The MUTCD, as mentioned earlier, does 23 meet criteria for pedestrian hybrid beacons which, in 24 our professional opinion, would be the appropriate

form of control at both of those locations in the 1 2 plan. This is the HAWK-type system, High intensity Activated crossWalk. This is a push-button activated 5 control; so if you're a pedestrian and want to get to the other side of the street, you push the button, the 6 signal goes red, people stop accordingly; and this is a regulatory enforceable-type form of traffic control. The secondary type would be more of an 10 advisory-type control. This is a beacon Cross Alert 11 12 System. This is an example that was actually 13 implemented on state highway. It's an accepted --14 it's on their accepted-equipment list now. So you see 15 that there are prominently displayed signs prominently marked "crossing," in this case with a supplemental 16 17 sign in the middle of the crosswalk. Beacons actually 18 are mounted on these poles and get activated in this 19 particular example by motion. So if you approach as a 20 pedestrian, you don't even have to push a button. 21 There's motion detection, these beacons then light up, 22 the motorist sees that there's something happening and 23 is more aware that there's a pedestrian crossing the

road.

24

Comment 17 related to on-site parking, and it's 1 2 really a point of clarification, and it does relate to the site-plan issue. It's not really a traffic issue per se, so I won't go into great detail, but there are 5 345 new parking spaces being proposed in the application which relates to a parking ratio of 1.78. 6 Pure objective statement. There was a reference back to a parking ratio of 1.4, and I think that related to the equivalent overall parking ratio when you took 10 into effect all of the spaces that currently exist 11 within Hancock Village property. So as an individual 12 application -- individual project -- its parking ratio is 1.78 not 1.42. 13 14 Comment 18. BETA suggested the need for a 1.5 crosswalk between Buildings 1 and 2 which will, in 16 fact, be incorporated into the design sets through the 17 ongoing BETA and Town review of those plans. 18 Comment 19. Emergency vehicle circulation. We've discussed this on several occasions. We've done 19 20 AutoTURN analysis that was provided to BETA in 21 electronic format. The nature of that analysis was to 22 model the largest vehicle type that would need to 23 access the property which is a tower truck. 24 feet long. It's a substantial vehicle. We've run

computerized models that would indicate that for each 1 2 of the design elements, whether the circle or cul-desac elements or hammerhead-type designs, that there is ample maneuvering area to accommodate that largest 5 vehicle type. I know that it is standard practice in the 6 industry to conduct this form of analysis to ensure 8 that you have ample curb radii, ample roadway-width-dimension layout to accommodate either one full circle movement of traditional cul-de-sac 10 11 design or a single backing movement in a hammerhead 12 design, both of which are accepted design practice 13 through precedent here in Brookline as well as other 14 communities that abut Brookline. 1.5 Comment 20 relates to that same issue. 16 question was whether or not the roadway width of 22 17 feet satisfies the need for emergency access and 18 circulation. It does based on the computer modeling 19 and is also consistent with the zoning requirements in 20 town. 21 Comment 21, pedestrian safety. This comment was 22 described or discussed at the March 26th hearing, and 23 it really relates to sidewalks and making sure that 24 for every building being proposed, there's a coherent

and connected way to get from that building to a 1 2 destination. The answer is that there are. fully integrated system of sidewalks that are being proposed that allow for connection to Baker's field, 5 for instance, without ever having to walk within a travel lane. You're either on a sidewalk or you're at a crossing point, and this illustrates for the existing Hancock Village where those sidewalk systems exist. 10 So you've got these dashed areas here, all of 11 which connect individual building units to sidewalks 12 along the street system that serves Hancock Village, 13 ultimately out into Independence Drive, and likewise, 14 on the other side. The proposed development shown in 1.5 red are the connections that would integrate with the 16 sidewalk systems within Hancock Village or would also 17 connect to the sidewalk systems in Independence Drive. 18 The one missing link today is actually on 19 20 Asheville. If you were walking down Asheville today, 21 there is a sidewalk there, but this is where it ends. 22 There's nothing at the terminal end of that. 23 application envisions an extension of that sidewalk to 24 connect to the existing sidewalk system that currently

serves this entire neighborhood, and again, this shows 1 2 that it's a pretty comprehensive system of those existing sidewalks. Comment 22. Again, a verbal point not in the 5 written peer review but related to the need -- or request rather -- to provide information for VFW 6 Parkway and Independence Drive, data for that. location is in Boston. It's a location that is likely to sustain an impact of less than one new car every 10 five minutes -- inconsequential -- and there's no 11 useful value or purpose to providing data or any 12 analysis of that location for those reasons. 13 again, recaps that as you approach VFW Parkway, which 14 is a signalized location, that the effect of this 1.5 project will be between nine and eleven new vehicle 16 trips. It's inconsequential and really not necessary 17 to provide any level of analysis for that Boston-based 18 location. Comment 23 relates to the data request that was 19 20 made for local neighborhood streets and the notion 21 that there would be increases in traffic on those 22 local streets, so we were asked to identify volume and 23 speed characteristics, and we've done that as 24 previously described. We know that the impact of the

project on local neighborhood streets like Bonad or 1 2 Russett is about one vehicle every two minutes or so. It's not a large impact, and, again, that recaps those volumes. 5 Comment 24. Russet/Asheville all-way stop control analysis was requested again during that 6 hearing, was provided. It doesn't meet the volumebased warrants but the applicant is -- the proponent is certainly willing to implement it at the discretion 10 and cooperation with the Town. 11 Comment 25 had to do with roadway-width standards 12 being applied to the project. That's a specific 13 design comment that will be addressed in the ongoing 14 review with BETA as part of the site plan and drainage 1.5 review. Really not subject to tonight's discussion. 16 Comment 26, comment to expand shuttle and Zipcar 17 services which the proponent has committed to do to 18 the extent that demand warrants. Zipcar controls how 19 many spaces they need and desire and how many vehicles 20 get positioned based on that demand. If they're asked 21 to look at it, they typically evaluate that in the 22 spring. The proponent will ask them every spring, "Can we get an extra car? Do we need an extra car?" 23

And certainly Chestnut Hill Realty currently -- the

24

- 1 proponent actually controls the existing shuttle.
- 2 That can be expanded based, again, on demonstrated
- 3 need and demand.
- 4 Comment 27, Independence and Sherman signal
- 5 control. The prior statement was: Look at the need
- 6 for full operating signals at that location. Simply
- 7 don't meet the warrants or criteria, but we do meet
- 8 the criteria for a HAWK or a beacon-type system which
- 9 the proponent is willing to implement.
- 10 Comment 28 relates, again, to the parking supply
- 11 ratio which subjectively is 1.78.
- 12 Comment 29, assuring that site lines and driveway
- 13 entrances are unimpeded. That's a site plan comment.
- 14 It will be addressed in more detail as part of the
- site plan review process undergoing with BETA.
- 16 Comment 30, ensuring proper crosswalk location.
- 17 There were specific comments made to specific
- 18 locations of crosswalks within the development which
- 19 will, again, be addressed as part of the ongoing
- 20 discussions with BETA and site-plan/drainage review.
- 21 And finally we're getting near the end. Comment
- 22 31. Question relates to a provision of a
- 23 construction-management plan and identifying specific
- 24 measures of control during construction. It is a

customary practice to provide a construction 1 2 management plan following the issuance of applicable permits, but prior to construction, that would identify appropriate truck travel routes, truck 5 restrictions, hour of construction activity, deliveries, worker-vehicle parking hours and locations 6 to the extent that it is not provided on the site, material lay-down areas and other features. So the CMP will endeavor to avoid and minimize 10 disruption to the traffic and parking on the local neighborhood streets. That's the objective of 11 construction management practices. That will be 12 13 provided, but it is only provided once permits are 14 issued and we know what the project is and what the 15 parameters of the project contain. 16 Comment 32, Independence Drive improvements. 17 BETA had suggested the need to identify Complete Street's design elements which were described earlier 18 as including bike lanes, parking aisles, curb bump-19 20 outs, reduced pedestrian crossings, and pedestrian 21 controls. 22 Comment 33. It really relates back to the safety 23 There was a discussion of the applicability 24 and appropriateness of hammerhead-type design

elements. We've evaluated these elements and have 1 2 demonstrated through computerized modeling that they provide sufficient area for a single backing movement to leave the scene of an incident. It's an acceptable 5 design practice. It's a design practice that's been used in Brookline. It's been used in other communities, and it's also a design practice that's endorsed and cited by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, AASHTO, in 10 their Green Book publication. In fact, this is an 11 excerpt from that publication that would indicate that various types of, as they call them, cul-de-sacs or 12 13 dead-end streets that in some cases involve a circular 14 element, a semicircular element, an L-shaped 15 hammerhead-type design, a T-type hammerhead design, a 16 Y-type hammerhead design, or a sideways T-type 17 design. 18 So there's various ways to achieve the required maneuvering areas for these types of projects for 19 20 those emergency vehicles that may need to use them. 21 Local examples we've covered in prior testimony to 22 include locations in not only Brookline, but Needham, 23 Newton, and other locations. 24 The most proximate, perhaps, is the Olmsted Hill

project, Fisher Hill. This is the Fisher Hill 1 2 development as it was approved by the Town. It consists of a single roadway that comes to a dead end at this location and has a hammerhead-type design, 5 more of a Y-type hammerhead design consistent with the AASHTO standard. That Y-type design, when you run 6 computer models through it, shows the same kind of maneuvering issues that are being proposed for this particular project. Another example of that, more of a T-type dead 10 11 end hammerhead design for a project in Needham, 12 Greendale Avenue. This is another example of a 13 hammerhead T-type design in Newton. All approved 14 within the past several years. So these are common 15 design elements recognized by publication and practice. Hammondswood, another example. 16 17 Comment 34, revised capacity analysis. 18 extent growth patterns were documented to be more than 19 one percent per year, BETA suggests the need for 20 revised analysis. That's not the case. We're 21 actually guessing high on growth. It's at one percent 22 annual growth. It's more than twice the actual 23 experience on Independence Drive, so we don't need to 24 revisit the capacity analysis. It's valid as

submitted. 1 2 That really concludes the responses. If Brian would like to add anything to that. MR. BREISEL: Hello, everyone. Don't worry. Ι'm 5 not going through all 34 questions or comments. Our March 20th letter detailed in the conclusion, 6 really, the outstanding issues, and then we issued a letter this afternoon that brings a follow-up. I'm not sure if you have that, but essentially Bob went 10 over what was requested and what the results were. I 11 just want to talk a little bit about why things were 12 requested just to give a little clarification of what 13 we were looking for and what information we were 14 hoping to gain and what that information does for us. 1.5 So the first point was the traffic volumes as Bob 16 had discussed. The traffic study used existing counts 17 the way they should. They did a growth factor for 18 no-build. As they should, they assume one percent. We just wanted to make sure that that one percent was 19 20 enough. So we had them go out and collect traffic 21 volumes which were a few years on now since they 22 collected their last ATRs in, as you can see here, 23 2007 and 2014. Shows that there's much less than one 24 percent per year, so that means that their traffic

Page 39

volumes and their analysis are appropriate. 1 2 While they were doing these counts, the automated counts, we also wanted them to get the speed data. The speed data on Independence Drive was -- we wanted 5 them to collect that so that we could do the stopping-site-distance requirements of the two driveways. They had based it on the speed limit, the posted speed limit. We just wanted to make sure if people were driving faster than the posted speed limit 10 and you base the stopping-site-distance requirements 11 on that, you're not really providing a safe 12 intersection. In this case, the speeds are below or 13 near the speed limit, and there is enough site 14 distance to meet the stopping-site-distance 15 requirements. So again, there's no further analysis needed on that. 16 17 The crash data was -- we wanted the Brookline 18 Police Department crash data. We knew that their 19 crash data -- your crash data, excuse me -- included 20 some information about crashes with pedestrians, and 21 most notably, at Sherman Road. We'll get more of 22 They collected data from the police department, 23 and it did show what we knew it had, so that came into 24 play when we were looking for the redesign of

Independence Drive. 1 2 Number 3 is the TDM measures. They have in the last MDM letter, they have committed to providing the TDM measures of the -- increasing the shuttling 5 service, you know, discussing with Zipcar and everything that Bob had discussed. 6 So we are satisfied with the response there. Our recommendation would be any decision that you make, there should be requirements or conditions that 10 require them to stick to the TDM measures, most 11 notably through -- I want to make sure I get this term 12 right -- through a signed TDM agreement as part of the 13 permitting process. You can get information on that 14 from your engineering department. That's just 1.5 basically a written -- you know, if it's in your 16 decision and new owners come into the property, the 17 future owners will be committed to continue the TDM as 18 these owners would -- or let's just say they end up 19 being bad neighbors, and they decide to stop the 20 shuttle service. Well, having that in your decision 21 will not allow them to do that. 22 The fourth one is discussing the traffic calming 23 in the residential neighborhood. We have a -- not a 24 discrepancy, but it's -- my response in today's letter

Page 41

1 was vague. 2 As you can see in this diagram, we had them -let me back up -- we had them collect traffic volume and traffic speed data along all the local roadways, 5 and that was to get -- to determine if there really is an issue with speeding or other issues that traffic 6 calming would solve. The issue with providing traffic calming measures on certain streets is that you end up just pushing it. So say we did -- right now, there's existing 10 11 traffic calming on South Street because that is a 12 collector road. If we put just traffic calming on 13 Russett Road, you would just push people onto Bonad 14 Road, so that's not really what we're after. 1.5 In this case, we have the stop signs at all the intersections, so if someone really, you know, doesn't 16 17 want to deal with the stop signs, the idea would be that they go to South Street. Of course there's now a 18 19 stop sign on South Street as well, so it might not 20 work. 21 There is the potential for including additional traffic demand, traffic calming measures along Bonad 22 23 and Russett. This way, you really try to push people 24 to South Street. We're noncommittal at this point.

There's no definite results that say how well traffic 1 2 calming measures work to push vehicles to a different path, so to say. We know traffic calming works for speed issues and for safety issues. We don't know how 5 well it works to redirect vehicles. So if it's something that the Town and the Board really feel strongly about wanting them, we could discuss, you know, different things we can do, but, at this point, we're kind of being noncommittal. The all-way stop was discussed at Asheville Road 10 11 and Russett Road. It doesn't meet stop-control warrants, but since there are other stop controls in 12 13 the area that are also not met, all of the existing 14 ones with the exception of South Street probably does 1.5 meet the warrant, but the other ones on Russett Road 16 and Bonad Road probably don't meet the warrants 17 either. I'm not the engineer stamping the plan, so if someone else wants to install them, that's between the 18 19 Town and those engineers. 20 Some of the other traffic calming has to deal 21 with, of course, the extensive work that we are requesting on Independence Drive. Basically what 22 23 we're looking for -- why we requested these changes is 24 currently there's two lanes of traffic in each

direction on Independence Drive, and then sporadically 1 2 as that blue car is showing -- both those blue cars -you'll have somebody parked. These are legal parking There's no signage against their parking. On the both ends -- well, on the Boston end of the 5 corridor there is only one travel lane, so we thought it would make sense to continue that through and provide the bike lanes and then also the shorter pedestrian crossing, which Bob discussed. Right now 10 it's 48 feet, essentially, from where this crosswalk 11 is to this crosswalk. You can see how much shorter it would be. It would be down to the -- in this design, 12 13 it's 32 feet: five for the bike lane, eleven for the 14 travel lane, eleven for the travel lane, and five for 1.5 the bike lane, so that's significantly shorter. 16 One of our requests is that when we get further into the design of this, you actually move the bike 17 18 lanes to be on the outside of the parking, essentially 19 along the curb. This is known as a cycle track. 20 provides a lot more protection for the bicyclist, and 21 it would also increase this bump-out, shortening this 22 cross to 22 feet. The pedestrians would now only be 23 crossing the two travel lanes. They would have 24 crossed the bike lane back here separately.

What this does for the bicyclist is right now you 1 have a car parked here. Well, they need to get into 2 that spot, and they need to get out of that spot, so they're crossing the bike lane. They also, which is a 5 big concern and a big issue, is they open their door without looking. And I say "they." I open my door without looking when I park next to a bike lane. just not something we're used to yet. So we have a lot of accidents and crashes with bicyclists hitting a driver opening his door. 10 11 So by moving that to the outside, you have far less interaction because there's probably -- or may 12 13 not be a passenger in a car, but also the plan would 14 include a buffer zone, so you narrow the parking as 1.5 much as you can, and then you provide a buffer. 16 way when someone does open their door, it's not into 17 the bike lane. Worst case scenario, if they do open 18 their door into the bike lane in this case, if they have time to react, they're falling into the 19 20 sidewalk. They're not falling into oncoming -- or 21 traffic that's driving, you know, in the same 22 direction as they are. So this the latest. This is part of NACTO 23 24 It's trying to get the bicyclist on the design.

outside instead of in the middle of the vehicles. 1 2 Another minor deal in here is that personally I prefer to have this beacon if it was a post-mounted beacon. I'll get into the HAWKs in a minute. I'd 5 rather have it on the short side, the near side of the crosswalk. It's just more visual for the driver as 6 they approach from here. You're going to see the flashing beacon. The pedestrian is behind it or further away, not the opposite way around. So that's 10 something, you know, that the final design would have 11 to incorporate. 12 As for the HAWK or the flashing yellow beacons, 13 the warrants are meant for the HAWK, so in my letter 14 from today, I mistakenly said it was only meant for 15 this intersection. It's actually meant for both 16 intersections, so we would recommend either the 17 flashing beacons as shown on this plan or the HAWK 18 system would be on a mast arm going out over the 19 roadway. 20 The HAWK system as you saw in the picture is a 21 new traffic signal. That's the downside right now. 22 Some people -- most people haven't seen these before. 23 I've never driven through one. I've seen them, 24 obviously, professionally. But they work the same

The red light is going to get people to stop 1 2 The idea is that they'll stop more than a flashing yellow beacon that would be on the side of the road for the pedestrians, so it's really just a 5 matter of how aggressive does the Town want to be. Do they want to implement complete pedestrian safety and have a little driver discomfort and not know what they're supposed to do? Or would they want to do it incrementally maybe and do the flashing beacons on the 10 side? We have had success with the flashing beacons. 11 Specifically, in this case, now it will be down to one 12 travel lane in each direction. You have two travel 13 lanes in one direction and the flashing beacon on the 14 side of the road isn't going to mean anything to the 1.5 guy who's driving in the left-hand lane. 16 And then finally the site circulation. The only 17 standards as far as traffic that we could really hold them to is the AutoTURN design that Bob showed. 18 have more comments from our site engineers that are 19 20 reviewing everything, but traffic-wise it's really --21 the AutoTURN is our gospel and the standard that we 22 have to hold them to. These designs, even though 23 they're small scale -- I have them bigger, when you 24 zoom in. They do stay in the road, on the site

roadways, and they do provide access to the site. 1 2 So that's all I had. I'm sure you've had enough of us talking at you. If anyone has questions, we'd be happy to answer them. 5 MR. GELLER: Thank you. Questions at this time? MR. BOOK: Because there was some discrepancy or 6 it wasn't clear from the testimony from the prior 8 hearing, is the -- parking is being provided at 1.78 spaces per dwelling unit. Is that an appropriate --MR. BEISEL: Right. There's been discrepancy --10 I think I know where you're going. You're wanting to 11 know what they should be providing in my opinion? 12 13 MR. BOOK: Well, yeah. I mean for this location, 14 there's sort of this suburban/urban -- I realize it's, 15 you know, it's sort of both. Is 1.78 the appropriate 16 parking ratio? 17 MR. BEISEL: In my opinion, that would be on the I've seen -- having done one specifically 18 high side. in Brookline -- even if you do, obviously Brookline is 19 20 much different out these windows than it is at the 21 site. But in Watertown where they're close to the bus 22 depo there and in Brighton where there's only bus 23 transportation or MBTA bus transportation, we've seen 24 as low a demand as just over 1 car per unit and we've

seen it go up to about 1.5. My recommendation in 1 2 these settings is 1.4 to 1.5. MR. BOOK: Okay. Thank you. I have another question. In the discussion about 5 traffic calming on Russett Road -- and you had made a comment, I think, in your letter today and then just 6 now that that would just push traffic onto a different road. So the question is: Is that a bad thing? it an advisable thing? Are there roads that are 10 better suited for the traffic? Or based upon the 11 analysis, is the additional traffic to be generated 12 from this project, is it, for lack of a better word, 13 inconsequential enough or low enough that it really 14 doesn't matter whether it's on Russett or on South 1.5 Street if that's where it was pushed to? 16 MR. BEISEL: The preference would be to have the 17 vehicles on South Street, so my recommendation would 18 be any traffic calming measures that are going to be 19 implemented on Russett Road should also be implemented 20 on Bonad Road because, otherwise, if someone's willing 21 to drive down Russett Street currently and you put 22 traffic calming and now they say, "Well, I don't want 23 to do that anymore, and I don't want to deal with it," 24 they're just going to go one over. They're not going

to go all the way to South Street because they would 1 2 be going on South Street now if that's what they were looking for. So whatever you do on Russett Road should be done on Bonad Road. 5 The issue there is now you're putting them onto Asheville Road and Grassmere Road for longer, so 6 there's really no perfect answer, but the preference would be to get them to South Street as quick as possible except if you're right along here on Asheville Road, you're obviously not happy that I'm 10 11 saying that right now. There's no one answer that's 12 right for this whole neighborhood. 13 MR. BOOK: And does the addition of the stop 14 sign -- I mean, I know there are stop signs there 15 now -- the addition, is that one of those measures 16 that would encourage people to do that so that they 17 don't have to keep stopping at every intersection every couple of hundred feet or so? 18 19 MR. BEISEL: Right. So stop signs aren't 20 typically used for traffic calming because what they 21 found is that it actually has people stop and then 22 they speed up and stop, but since they're here 23 already, it does make sense to finish the equation, 24 essentially, and put one at all four of the internal

1 intersections. 2 Currently, if they're coming out and they're stopping at Russett Road, putting up a stop sign at Asheville Road isn't going to all of a sudden make 5 them go to South Street though, so I don't want anyone to think that this stop sign or that I'm implying that 6 this stop sign is going to solve anyone from ever driving down Russett Road again. It might -- these stop signs together might be enough to get people to 10 go to South Street, but, again, with the stop sign on 11 South Street, they're going to impact -- they're going to experience stops either way. 12 You would do additional -- there could be a 13 14 request for additional measures on here that, 15 basically, if you're stopping at all three no matter 16 what, but now you have a chicane or something else 17 along these roads, well, that might deter someone to 18 get onto South Street. It might not. You know, it's really up to each driver and how aggressive they are 19 20 and just what they'd rather do. Would they rather sit 21 in a little bit more traffic on South Street when they 22 get to the signal or would they rather go over a speed 23 table or whatever the answer is? 24 So there's really no way to give you an exact

answer of putting this in will stop anyone from this 1 2 project ever traveling down these local roads. It's always going to be a driver's decision. MR. LISS: Just to follow up on that, I think the 5 next logical question is: Are the additional units -what is the impact on the flow? And I think he did 6 ask: Is it consequential or is it inconsequential? understand it's going to increase to some degree, and I know it's everyone's job to determine what that 10 increase will be. But is it material or not material, 11 in your opinion? 12 MR. BEISEL: Here are the existing daily volumes, 13 so let's just use Russett Road as an example. 14 490 vehicles. The trip distribution would add 43 15 during the peak hours, so that's 10 percent. You can 16 assume that the p.m. peak hour is about 10 percent of 17 the daily total, so you would be doubling the Russett Road traffic. Now, can Russett Road handle another 18 19 430 daily trips? The answer is yes because the 20 volumes are so low. Percent increase is pretty 21 significant, though. If you have one car and you add 22 one car, it's a hundred percent increase. If you have 23 a thousand and add one, no one's going to notice. 24 there will be more traffic, but the roads are able to

- handle it. 1 MR. LISS: Thank you. 2 MR. HUSSEY: I happened to be driving down Russett Road today, and it seemed to me there's 5 parking on both sides. Now, it seemed to be pretty 6 narrow once you have two cars there. Both were just regular traffic, but with emergency traffic, it could be a problem. Does it make any sense to make that and Bonad one way in opposite directions? MR. BEISEL: I guess not. We'd have to look at 10 11 it more and see what the interactions were with Independence Drive on each end, but, you know, it 12 13 seems like no matter what the engineering study 14 shows... 1.5 I do want to mention -- and I said it quickly in 16 the letter -- that the on-street parking could also be 17 considered a traffic calming measure. If people don't 18 feel comfortable driving down the road now with cars parked on the road, well, a chicane does essentially 19 20 the same thing. It narrows the road, and makes the 21 driver feel insecure. They slow down, or they choose
 - 23 So would additional traffic calming measures work 24 even more? I'm not sure. You would also be losing

not to go that way.

22

- 1 parking wherever we implemented whatever measure we
- 2 put in, so there's a lot of give and take with traffic
- 3 calming.
- 4 MR. HUSSEY: What about the possibility of, as my
- 5 brother here suggested, of parking only on one side on
- 6 those roads?
- 7 MR. BEISEL: Again, that'd be up to the
- 8 neighbors. It would also be up to the engineering
- 9 department, and enforcement would be the other issue.
- 10 You'd have to put signs up on whatever side. In my
- 11 estimation, the only thing it would do is encourage
- 12 people to drive on Russett Road because now you're
- 13 putting people on one side of the road and you're
- leaving more travel width, so they're going to be more
- encouraged to drive that way, so I wouldn't personally
- 16 recommend it in this case.
- 17 MR. HUSSEY: Okay.
- 18 MR. ZUROFF: Just following on that thought, I
- 19 live on a road where there's only parking on one side
- 20 nearby. It works in my neighborhood. It does
- 21 prevent, I think, to a degree the possibility of
- 22 children running out on both sides, and I was just
- 23 wondering -- it's been asked and you've answered it --
- 24 but I'm just wondering if that really isn't a

- 1 possibility for allowing traffic flow to be better
- while not necessarily making it a freeway.
- 3 MR. BEISEL: Right. It's a give and take. There
- 4 would be more -- pedestrians would have more
- 5 visibility without on-street parking, obviously, but
- 6 it would probably also encourage increased speeds and
- 7 maybe increase traffic volume, so it's a give and
- 8 take. If you have one existing issue, you may do
- 9 something if you're trying to alleviate that issue.
- 10 In this case, to me, taking out the parking would
- 11 create the issue of encouraging extra volume onto
- 12 those roads.
- 13 MR. ZUROFF: All right. And then just
- 14 backtracking a little bit. There was a representation
- that the increased occupancy in this development would
- 16 add, I think, on average some number of cars per
- 17 hour. I'm more concerned about how many cars it adds
- 18 at rush hour when there's higher volume, because we
- 19 know that nobody's driving at 2:30 in the afternoon --
- 20 well, maybe that's school hours, but maybe 4:00 in the
- 21 afternoon or 11:00 in the morning, so what is the real
- 22 effect of -- not the average, but what actual increase
- takes place at the highest volume?
- MR. BEISEL: Well, I don't want to defend their

traffic study, but they followed industry standards 1 2 which we expected. These two slides here, the a.m. peak hour and the p.m. peak hour, what you do is you collect traffic volumes between 7:00 and 9:00 in the 5 morning and 4:00 to 6:00, so these volumes that you see here, the 34 vehicles on Russett Road, that's over one hour, the highest hour. You're not going to have 34 every hour. Like I said, the p.m. peak hour is about 10 percent of the daily total, so in the p.m., you'll have 43 vehicles during that hour. 10 11 This is the worst case scenario. This is what we 12 do to analyze the intersections, to get our letter 13 grades, and specifically to set signal timings during 14 the peak hour to try to keep traffic moving better. 15 The results that you're seeing in their study and on 16 these slides are that essentially worst case commuting 17 peak period or peak hour. It's one hour within those two-hour windows, so if it's 7:00 to 9:00, the peak 18 hour could be 7:15 to 8:15, or it's somewhere in that 19 20 two-hour window. And, of course, if there's 43 21 between 7:00 and 8:00, there's likely going to be 40 22 or 41 between 8:00 and 9:00. We're not just saying it 23 drops off, but that is the absolute apex, and then, 24 you know, it's a bell curve. There's a little less

- the hour before and a little less the hour after. 1 2 MR. ZUROFF: So are the traffic signals varied at different times of the day? MR. BEISEL: Yes. From the 2004 FDR, which I'm 5 not completely familiar with, but the two traffic signals on Independence at South Street and Beverly 6 will have different timings throughout the day. They're coordinated with each other, so if you're traveling, say, from Grove Street to Independence Drive towards Boston, if you get through the South 10 11 Street intersection, you'll get through the Beverly 12 Street intersection. Now, how that coordination works 13 will change throughout the day depending on the 14 traffic volume and when you have more cars in one 1.5 direction or another. 16 In this case, it's new equipment, so it is done 17 properly. That's not always the case, so when you get 18 to a traffic light and it seems to make no sense, it 19 probably wasn't us doing it wrong. It probably just
- you don't want to drive in a car with me because 22 that's all I do when we get to a red light, and my
- 23 wife's had enough of it at this point.
- 24 MR. ZUROFF: Thank you.

hasn't been updated and isn't running efficiently, and

20

21

MR. GELLER: So this goes to signal 1 2 synchronization? 3 MR. BEISEL: Right. MR. GELLER: This has been done, but it'll be 5 fine-tuned, I assume, once --MR. BEISEL: Yes. That could be another 6 condition, that you have the proponent monitor the 8 traffic volumes to see if there is a need for traffic signal timing changes if they become occupied. That's 10 one way to protect the Town. This way the Town is not 11 the one -- the engineering department isn't the one 12 funding the study to see what, if any, traffic-timing 13 changes need to be made. 14 MR. GELLER: Have they studied all additional 1.5 locations that you would want them to study? MR. BEISEL: Yes. There's never been an issue 16 17 with the study area. Of course, people have asked about the VFW intersection that's in Boston. The city 18 19 is aware or will be made aware of this project. I 20 have no jurisdiction to force them to review it. I 21 also partially agree with Bob when he says there's not 22 all that much traffic going down there and there is 23 such a high volume through that intersection that I 24 don't expect the queues to all of a sudden double in

- length trying to get from Independence to VFW.
- 2 MR. GELLER: Thank you. Any other questions?
- 3 No? Thank you again.
- 4 What I'd like to ask now is: Who's here on
- 5 behalf of town departments to speak this evening?
- 6 MR. WARD: Chief of Operations, Rob Ward,
- 7 Brookline Fire Department.
- 8 MR. GELLER: Please go ahead.
- 9 MR. WARD: I was just here to answer questions if
- 10 anybody had any.
- MR. GELLER: Questions? Mr. Hussey?
- MR. HUSSEY: No questions.
- 13 MR. GELLER: No questions, okay. So you're
- satisfied in terms of hammerhead issues, emergency
- 15 vehicles?
- 16 MR. HUSSEY: Well, I think if the fire department
- is satisfied, I think that covers it. I don't have
- 18 any.
- 19 MR. GELLER: Okay. Thank you. You are free.
- MR. WARD: Would you like me to stay for any
- 21 citizens?
- MR. GELLER: If you would, please.
- Just by a show of hands, how many people from the
- 24 public intend to speak this evening? Okay. So why

don't we work our way -- yes, you have a question? 1 2 MR. LEVIN: I'd just like to make a comment in answer to one of the questions. MR. GELLER: One of the questions? 5 MR. LEVIN: That was posed to the --MR. GELLER: Sure. 6 MR. LEVIN: Good evening. My name is Mark 8 Levin. I'm with Chestnut Hill Realty. A question was asked about the adequacy of the 10 parking at 1.78. When we evaluated the program, one 11 of the major considerations that we undertook was to 12 avoid at all costs having any spillover into the 13 neighborhood. 14 Secondly, we recognize that the demographic of 1.5 the new residents are very different than the 16 demographic of the existing Hancock Village residents 17 based on the rent structure, frankly. I think they will be more affluent, more likely to have cars. 18 19 Lastly, I'd just like to point out that zoning 20 calls for over two cars per residential unit. 21 MR. GELLER: Thank you. So if people from the 22 public who want to speak, if you can line up to that 23 side and then approach the dais and speak. Start by 24 giving us your name.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Selectman Ken Goldstein. Ouick 1 2 question. I'd like to ask Deputy Ward is he satisfied with the provisions that have been made for the fire trucks? 5 MR. WARD: I'm sorry I didn't clarify the first time. While that hammerhead may allow our pieces to 6 turn with the ratios, we're still not satisfied. What happens when we respond is it's not going to be just one truck. If there's a fire up there, there's going 10 to be five -- at least five respond, and that first 11 truck could go to the hammerhead, but then it's not going to be able to get by the rest. They're going to 12 13 be lined up on that street, and we don't believe it's 14 going to be wide enough, if that answers it. 1.5 MR. GELLER: Have there been any issues? There are, I understand, existing projects in Brookline that 16 17 utilize the hammerhead technology? MR. WARD: It's the same problem. Once we're in 18 there, it's a long time getting out which ties up the 19 20 trucks, and it's a backup issue that we don't like at 21 all. MR. GELLER: So there have been incidents at 22 23 existing --24 MR. WARD: What happens is if we can just pull

- 1 right out, we're back in service. If we have to wait
- 2 for all those trucks to back up -- which we don't like
- 3 backing up trucks at all -- it just takes that much
- 4 more time. The pieces are tied up there and unable to
- 5 respond to other incidents.
- 6 MR. LISS: Are you aware of any position by
- either this department or any other local departments,
- 8 whether it's on a state or national level, any
- 9 organization or any response to -- this is obviously
- 10 an accepted standard by these engineers -- is there
- anything, a statement by you or by a state agency or
- someone to offer an adjustment?
- 13 MR. WARD: I think Chief Ford is working on
- 14 that. He's out of town right now. I looked today. I
- did not find anything in NFPA or the United States
- 16 Fire Administration on these turns.
- 17 MR. LISS: Thank you.
- 18 MR. GELLER: Thank you. Are there any
- 19 follow-ups? Thank you.
- 20 MS. FRAWLEY: Regina Frawley. Town Meeting
- 21 Member, Precinct 16, Russett Road residence, 46
- 22 years.
- 23 I'm fairly familiar with the traffic patterns in
- the area, and there were multiple meetings up in Town

- 1 Hall over the mini rotary on South Street. As a Town
- Meeting Member, I can tell you I've had virtually
- dozens of complaints from people on Bonad Road because
- 4 they now have significantly higher volume because
- 5 people avoid the rotary. So I don't know. I don't
- 6 see any Town Meeting Members from Bonad Road, but I
- 7 attest to you anecdotally, I've had multiple
- 8 complaints. With just that mini rotary, there's been
- 9 more than double the volume on Bonad Road and a lot of
- 10 complaints and unhappy people. So that's number one I
- 11 want to put on the record.
- Just to follow up on Mr. Ward's comments, if you
- 13 look, you probably still have a copy of the record to
- Mass Development by Chief Ford, and he doesn't think
- it's adequate, and I don't think he's changed his mind
- 16 since the design hasn't changed on the buffers. Thank
- 17 you.
- 18 MR. GELLER: Thank you.
- 19 MR. VAROL: Hello. My name is William Varol. I
- 20 live at 45 Asheville Road which is right at the
- 21 intersection of Asheville and the entrance to Hancock
- 22 Village. I've been there for about seven years now.
- 23 First of all, I'd just like to say that, you
- 24 know, I agree that the reports did try and stick to

industry standards, but as one statistic says that we 1 2 spend about 38 hours a year in dead traffic, you know that the standards aren't an exact science. The first issue I'd like to talk about is the 5 study area. Both the designer and the reviewer felt that the study was adequate. I have to respectfully disagree. I have to remind them that I am a professional engineer. I'm a civil engineer with over 22 years of experience. We just spent several minutes 10 talking about how we're going to direct all this 11 traffic onto South Street, but no one's talked about 12 the South Street/VFW Parkway interchange which is in Brookline. It's not that distant far off land of 13 14 Boston, and also the Russett Road/VFW Parkway. Those 1.5 are very important intersections we studied, and the 16 fact that they were left out of the study area is 17 just -- I just don't see how they couldn't connect the 18 dots. The South Street/VFW is very important for a lot 19 20 of reasons. One of them is because it has so much 21 traffic because everyone who lives in that 22 neighborhood, if they're going to Boston, they go out 23 to South Street, then they go to that intersection, 24 then they take a left. If they're going to Dedham or

Route 1, they go right down Russett, or if they live 1 2 on Bonad or South Street already, they go towards one of those intersections and they take a right. are the two most important turning events in the whole 5 neighborhood, so the fact that they were left off the study area -- they're both in Brookline -- is very 6 confusing to me. Also, I know -- as I walk -- as I think I explained before, I walk to the train every day. 10 walk from my house on Asheville Road down to the 11 intersection of South Street and VFW Parkway, and I 12 cross at that light because it's the only safe place 13 to cross. The traffic on VFW Parkway is extremely 14 heavy, and I could not cross it if it wasn't a 15 signalized intersection, and I can report to you that, 16 you know, I'm not as fast as I used to be, but with 17 that walk signal, it's almost impossible for me to get 18 across in one walk cycle, so kids on bikes or smaller kids or older people, there's no way they can get 19 20 across there. 21 Also I can report that I know for a fact there have been several accidents at that intersection. 22 23 fact, every time I hit that walk button, I can look 24 down and I can see that there's been broken car parts,

1-800-325-3376

glass or whatever, and I know that traffic light has 1 2 been replaced many times from direct vehicle impacts. I know it's very dangerous, and the reason it's so dangerous is because of the site distance. Coming up 5 towards Boston, you're coming up from Crest Hill, and people trying to make that left-hand turn to go down 6 South Street, there's almost no site distance. The VFW Parkway, it's got trees all along the way that make it very beautiful, but once you have those 10 trees lined up at the distance that they're set, you 11 don't see anything but a row of trees; you can't see 12 the cars coming. Same at the Russett Road 13 intersection. As you try and look and look down the 14 road to see cars coming, you can't see anything 1.5 because of the trees, so the fact that those two intersections in Brookline were left off of the 16 17 report -- they're within a stone's throw of the development -- is kind of puzzling to me. 18 19 And then I want to talk about the study area, but 20 the study time. You know, we talked about the area, 21 but I think people made the point at the last traffic 22 meeting that Beverly Road, during winter months, 23 becomes one way. I don't think that was ever studied 24 as part of the thing. That certainly changes the

traffic in that area. Now cars can no longer go up 1 2 and down Beverly Road. They have to go up to the next street, take a left, go around, come down Beverly Road, so the fact that that was never studied is just 5 surprising to me. And then the speed data. I know there was a speed-data instrument attached to the tree outside my 8 house. I know it was probably around February because I was shoveling snow when I noticed it, and then they 10 came back about a month later and they put it up, and 11 as far as I know, there's only been one day in 2007 12 and one day in 2014 of speed data that was used to 13 compare. They were within 1 or 2 percent, and they 14 said that's good, but I know that they've had many 15 more days of recording data, and this could lead to 16 the fact that maybe some of this data was cherry-17 picked to make it look good, and I don't want to say 18 that that's what they've done but until you see all 19 the data that's been collected, you really won't 20 know. 21 And again, the traffic sampling size is too 22 small. If you're comparing one day in 2007 and one 23 day in 2014, that's not a comparison. That's just 24 random.

```
And then one thing I want to talk to that they
 1
      put a lot of emphasis on was the 85th percentile of
 2
               They said that 85th percentile is, you know,
      right around the speed limit, so that's a good number
 5
      to use. Well, there was a lot of discussion that
      during the day people park on these roads, Russett,
      Bonad, Asheville, and the residents know that it's
      basically alternating one-way traffic during the day
      and especially in winter when you have snowbanks.
10
      It's even worse. Some days you can't even get
11
      through, so those cars are crawling through at about 2
12
      miles per hour. At night around 7:00, everyone knows
13
      that you can't have your car on the street in
14
      Brookline, so all the cars are in the driveways off
15
      the streets and cars are flying up and down that
16
      road.
17
           So you really have two situations. You have 10
18
      miles an hour or less during the day and probably 50
      miles an hour at night, so to just say, "Oh, the
19
20
      average is 30. Let's do our study based on that." It
21
      just doesn't make sense. You really have to look at
22
      the extremes because the averages wear out.
                                                   So when
23
      you look at site distances, you shouldn't be looking
24
      at those average 85th percentile speeds. You should
```

be looking at the higher speeds. You look at the 85th 1 2 percentile when the condition exists that there aren't cars on the road because that's when you want to know the site distances. 5 And then the other thing that I saw throughout their rebuttal was this site distance analysis, these 6 analyses, this construction stuff will be presented at a later date. Well, I'm an engineer, and I know you don't have to wait. You can do this analysis now. 10 They have all the data. There's no reason to wait for 11 all these site distances or whatever to be figured out 12 after the project's been constructed. You know, 13 they've already cut down all the trees. What are they 14 going to do when they find out there's not site 1.5 distance? They're going to have to start cutting down 16 houses, I guess. 17 And then, once again, I want to just point out that in Table 6, they talk about the incidence of 18 accidents and they talk about the shaded areas that 19 20 impact -- whether it's pedestrians that are impacted, 21 and those pedestrians impacted are more likely going 22 to be children trying to cross the street going to 23 that school, so I just want to keep that in mind.

We're talking about these -- just circles on the

24

Page 69

screen. More likely than not, this development is 1 2 being built to bring children into Baker School, and those incidents, when someone looks at this ten years from now, aren't just going to be gray-colored 5 circles. They're going to be children most likely because those are the people trying to get across. I just want you to know we're putting a face on this, what we're trying to do with all these increases. Then, when they talk about traffic calming and 10 they say there's no need for additional traffic 11 calming. You know, the last couple of nights, it's 12 been nice out, sleep with the windows open. Right 13 now, the driveway coming out of Asheville Road is 14 about 8 percent grade. Cars fly down that road, and I 15 can hear them bottoming out right at the end of my 16 driveway as they come and screech to a halt at the 17 stop sign which is about 50 yards down from the entrance down there. 18 So to say that traffic calming isn't necessary, I 19 20 think, is totally wrong. I don't see why they don't 21 look at speed bumps at the entrance to all the Hancock 22 Village sites, traffic gates. Why not have traffic 23 gates there? That would force someone to stop. A lot 24 of these communities, gated communities, have them.

They'll have a code; they'll put it up, and then 1 2 they'll be sure that kids can cross the street. Cars will come to a complete stop, and they'll be safer. As I said, it's alternating one-way traffic. It's 5 neighborhoods; there's lots of kids. I don't see why they can say, "Well, it doesn't meet this strict code 6 that was written to try and adhere to a million different scenarios." The other thing is the new trips. Comment 9. There's 40 new additional trips. They kind of blow it 10 11 off and say that's no big deal. It's only 40 trips. 12 It's only another trip, you know, a minute or so per 13 hour, but if you're increasing the traffic by 60 14 percent, but then you're turning around and saying, 15 "Well, we estimated 1 percent growth per year, and that was very conservative of us to do that." They're 16 17 using over 60 years capacity to develop the area with 18 this one project. Does that make sense to allow this 19 organization to come in, use this one project to 20 develop that Asheville Road neighborhood for the next 21 hundred years because, really, we saw that the actual 22 growth was around half percent. So half percent, 23 they're increasing by 60 percent. That's 120 years of 24 development they're using in this one project. To me

those numbers don't add up. 1 The comment number 11, they talk about equal 2 dispersion. Yeah, they're putting several driveways in, but 70 to 75 percent of the traffic is going to be 5 going up Asheville Road where I live and my neighbors live, going to the high-rise, so to say that yeah, we 6 have three or four different locations so we can equally disperse it, it doesn't make sense. 70 percent of the traffic is going up to the high-rise, and that's what should be studied. 10 11 And then the sidewalks. You know, what they say 12 is they're adding additional new sidewalks, but 13 they're also destroying probably hundreds of feet of 14 sidewalk. I know there's sidewalk right now from VFW 15 Parkway all the way up to Baker School. That whole amount is going to be eliminated and put in with 16 17 parking and houses, so when they says they're adding, 18 what's the net gain? Is it a net gain? Is it a net loss? Should be easy to figure out, right? 19 20 And then they say they're going to connect the 21 Asheville Road sidewalk to all the other sidewalks 22 within this unit and make it all access friendly, but 23 the current plans that I've seen, there's a 10 percent 24 grade going up to that high-rise. From Asheville Road

up 10 percent? And they say they're going to make all 1 2 these walkways ADA compliant. There's no way someone in a wheelchair is going to push themselves from my house up to the high-rise with a 10 percent grade. 5 They would need multiple switchbacks, level areas, 6 everything. So it seems like they just make these comments saying that we will comply, we will do this, but they don't actually have the plans to back it up, saying we 10 do comply. So I think before any decisions are made, 11 the proof has to be in the pudding. The plan has to 12 be there complete and fully analyzed to make sure it 13 works. 14 One of the things that really bothers me about 15 the existing development and what really bothers me about the new development is satellite parking. They 16 17 say they're going to add all these spaces, 1.78, but 18 they kind of gloss over the fact that a lot of these 19 spaces are going to be satellite spaces. Now everyone 20 knows, when you come home with a load of groceries, 21 you're not going to park 200 yards away from your 22 house and grab 80 grocery bags and carry them all the 23 way to your house. You're going to double park 24 somewhere, and that's what they do all the time.

have a picture on my phone. I went out and said, you 1 2 know, I should really take a photo of this. I'll see if I can do it. As soon as I went out, there's someone on the 8 percent grade, 20 foot wide, with 5 their hazards on, unloading their car, making several trips just to get all their groceries into the house. Now, when all these people have to park far from their house, transport all these things, portage all this stuff, they're going to be double parking. 10 That's going to affect the fire department. If a fire 11 breaks out and the fireman has to get down there in time, other cars, 10 percent grades, and curves with 12 13 double parking. It's a recipe for disaster, so I 14 really think the satellite parking needs to be 1.5 investigated a little more. 16 One of the data I looked at that wasn't really 17 talked about tonight was the trip generation. I think 18 the trip generation estimated was 1.7 trips per day. You know, if people are going to go to work and come 19 20 back, that's two trips. That means if they leave 21 Hancock Village again, they can't come back. So how 22 many people leave -- because this is the only 23 entrance -- so how many people leave Hancock village 24 and don't come back? I mean, at the very least, a

trip generation should be probably an even number. 1 2 Then I just want to talk about the Independence Drive plans. They talk about cross-sections where they're going to pull areas in, add these bike lanes, 5 traffic calming, turn it into Route 16. First of all, my dentist is on Route 16, and if I had to go to the dentist more than twice a year, I'd get a new dentist because Route 16 is a mess. It's a total traffic nightmare. Secondly, why put a bike lane in if it doesn't go 10 They're going to put a bike lane from just 11 anywhere? past the traffic signal at the Beverly Road down to 12 13 where? Down to CVS or something with about 15 bump-14 outs, three crossings, five HAWK systems. I mean, 1.5 what does that do anymore? What's the purpose of 16 that? So you're basically taking away capacity from 17 Independence Drive just to provide this system that -really, you know, bike lanes have to be part of a 18 global scheme, and overall, and if you look at what 19 20 they've done in Boston with the bike lanes, they don't 21 put them in 300 yards here and 300 yards over there. They're continuous, contiguous, and everything. 22 23 you want to bring Hubway bicycles to Brookline, you 24 know, we should be thinking of a comprehensive system

and not these little segments that really don't join 1 2 up with anything. And then they talk about the construction management plan, that, yeah, this is just something 5 that we'll deal with like every project; we deal with it in the future, and don't worry about it; we'll take care of it. They're going to be taking away thousands of yards of this rock material that they're blasting out of there. That is a lot of trucks that's going to 10 destroy the streets. They should be doing pavement 11 analysis. A lot of people look at pavement. They 12 don't realize you actually design the pavement to handle the loads. I haven't seen -- that's something 13 14 we do for every job that I work with in my job. 15 haven't seen any pavement analysis, any pavement 16 design. Can the road handle it? Are they going to 17 replace the roads in all those neighborhoods after 18 their project is over. I mean, these are things that 19 can be addressed right now. 20 I mean, a project I'm working on right now is the 21 Fall River bridge in Quincy. It's on Route 3A, a 22 major route. That was a major part of the preliminary 23 design was traffic because we're bringing in millions 24 of pounds of steel. Hundreds of truckloads are going

to be in there, and the towns were very involved 1 2 before the project was delivered to make sure there was routes in place, to make sure that it could be handled. So this is not something you put on the back 5 burner and want to discuss at some later date. And then they talk about they're changing, I 6 guess, the plan, once again, to the high-rise, and I guess the plan is to keep changing the plans until all the traffic meetings are over, and then they just 10 change it to the one they want. I mean, how can we 11 have a traffic meeting if the plans don't even show 12 where the road is going to be at this point? 13 doesn't make sense to try and make this decision --14 this is the final meeting, and they can't make a 1.5 300-yard road from my driveway to the hotel on the hill. 16 17 And then, one of the things that bothers me the most is the pedestrian crossing to the playground 18 across the VFW Parkway. Again, how this was left out 19 20 of the study area just blows my mind. I mean, they're 21 taking all the green space of this project and they're 22 building on it. This is a place that every single day 23 on days like today when it's nice out is filled with 24 children playing baseball, soccer, running around,

having fun. There'll be no place for them to do this 1 2 anymore once this project is built. They have no choice but to go across to Hynes Field in Boston, across the street, across four lanes of VFW Parkway, 5 and I see it every day. Mothers grabbing their children because South Street is too far away, and the other crosswalk way down by CVS is too far away. you've got a 2-year-old, by the time you walked across these crosswalks, you'd want to go home. You'd be worn out. So the mothers grab their children, they 10 11 look, they see the cars, and then they book across. And this is only going to get worse, and I guarantee 12 13 this project gets through without addressing this, 14 there's going to be serious accidents there. This is 15 a major destination point, and the pedestrians have been, in my opinion, totally overlooked in this whole 16 17 project. 18 And then, you know, again the emergency vehicles. I think the point is being missed about 19 20 whether these emergency vehicles can navigate inside 21 the newly proposed development, but can they even get 22 to it? I mean, there's been talk about how the city 23 of Boston is going to respond to some of these 24 emergencies because they're closer than Brookline.

But last night, in the middle of the night, the fire 1 2 department was outside my house. I'm not sure why, but there was -- like he said -- at least five units and police cars responded. They were all outside the 5 You know, luckily it was nighttime because during the day they could not get down Asheville or Bonad or whatever. But these responded, and it took them a while without any cars just to get the vehicles out of there. So when there's all these cars in here and all 10 these new people, are we putting all these people that 11 are just coming to get the education at Baker School 12 13 or whatever at risk because the streets in the service 14 area just cannot handle these emergency vehicles? And 15 it only takes one, you know, new fire person going 16 down the wrong road, and someone's car that's -- just 17 because of the trees and the congestion -- is a little 18 too close to the car on the other side of the street, and the truck's stuck, and there's five more trucks 19 20 stuck behind him. There's nowhere to back up, and 21 everyone's stuck in the neighborhood while this new 22 development is burning or whatever, so I think that's 23 one of the key issues that really has to be addressed 24 and not necessarily -- in addition to the ability to

- maneuver inside the site. So I just think that's 1 2 another thing that has to be studied. I quess that ends my comments. I'll let other people go, but I thank you for your time. 5 MR. GELLER: Thank you very much. MR. KRUG: I'm Steven Krug, and I live at 237 6 Russett, right at the corner of VFW and Russett. Two of the three things I want to say will be very similar, but hopefully they'll be different enough, and I'll try and keep them quick. 10 11 One is the idea of a four-way stop at Asheville. 12 I travel several times a day from my corner of Russett 13 out to Independence on Russett. Now, I treat that 14 intersection as a four-way stop. I come very close to 15 a stop at that intersection because so many times in the years I've lived there, probably about four or 16 17 five times a year, I have watched people blow through
- I don't know whether it's because of the grade or
- 21 because there are other intersections nearby that are

that stop sign, not come to a rolling stop, look

around, and proceed, but blow through that stop sign.

- four-way stops, so they assume it's a four-way stop.
- I don't know what the reason is, but I do know that
- I'm happy that there aren't an incidence of accidents

18

19

at that intersection, but it's not because people 1 2 don't run through that intersection. So I would be perfectly fine with that being a four-way stop if, in fact, it would keep anybody from getting killed there. 5 They're going to supposedly change the grade, but whatever. The other thing about Russett Road that's come up -- you asked a question about it, and he mentioned it -- is that it's a very narrow street, so when I go 10 from my corner down to Independence, I would say at 11 least -- I've been trying to actually think about it 12 for the last month and keep an eye on it -- at least 13 every other day, I end up stopping as though I was on 14 a beach road at Martha's Vineyard and blinking my 15 lights at somebody to decide which one of us is going 16 to go through first. We have to signal right away to 17 each other, and it's not just when there are cars 18 parked on both sides. It's a very narrow street. It's lined with those wonderful trees, and it's narrow 19 20 enough that if somebody has an SUV parked on one side 21 of it, not even out from the curb, there is not room 22 for two cars to pass there, so I just wonder what's 23 going to happen when a whole line of traffic coming 24 out of Asheville is heading for Independence and

somebody's coming the other way. I just, you know, 1 2 what will happen I think is that they'll go some place else. I think it's completely unclear what the traffic 5 pattern is that would emerge from this, and I think it's going to depend on those kinds of variations. 6 But I think it's irresponsible to say we can average out this traffic over this whole network of streets, you know, in the area. I don't think that's how it's 10 going to work. I don't know where it will end up. 11 And the last thing I want to say was this idea of 12 making Independence two lanes. That's fine. 13 Independence, in many ways, is two lanes because there 14 are often cars parked along portions of Independence, 1.5 but I wonder what would happen if it's two-way and you 16 then have traffic coming home in the evening rush hour 17 and attempting to make a left turn into either this 18 new quarter-mile long driveway or the existing driveway to make a left turn to get back into Hancock 19 20 Village. If it's two lanes, then they're going to be 21 holding up traffic until they can make their turn, and 22 I doubt if many of them would do it right past the 23 Russett Road/Beverly intersection because that 24 driveway's only going to be, what, like a hundred feet

- or a couple of hundred feet from that intersection.
- 2 So if people were stopping there to make a left turn,
- 3 then traffic is obviously going to back up through
- 4 that traffic light.
- It just seems to me there hasn't been sort of an
- 6 attempt to say, well, what's actually going to happen
- 7 with all this traffic? What's the effect of this
- 8 going to be?
- 9 That's all. Thank you.
- 10 MR. GELLER: Thank you.
- 11 MR. CHIUMENTI: My name is Steve Chiumenti. I
- 12 live at 262 Russett Road, a Town Meeting Member for
- 13 Precinct 16, and I was going to comment specifically
- on the letters themselves, the comments and the
- 15 responses.
- 16 One thing I noticed is that if you read BETA's
- 17 report that they number their comments, and if you
- look at MDM's responses, they number their comments
- 19 differently. They kind of don't flow exactly, so I
- think they've all been using MDM's numbers, so my
- 21 first comment really is Comment 2 on the MDM report,
- 22 which was Comment 1 on BETA's. I'll just refer to
- 23 MDM.
- 24 Comment 2 was BETA had noted that the ATR should

collect traffic volume data to determine whether or 1 2 not traffic volumes in the study area have increased since 2007. Daily traffic volume should also be collected along Russett Road and Asheville Road in 5 order to compare traffic volumes previously collected 6 by the Town. My comment is the ATR data presented compares a single day in September 2007 to a single day in April 2014. We would like to know if there were more days recorded during each period, and I think the 10 11 suggestion was there were, and if there was data selection. We'd also like to know what the expected 12 13 day-to-day variation of traffic volume is and whether 14 a comparison of a single day is a valid methodology. 1.5 There are many conclusionary statements in the 16 report based on extremely limited data. The request 17 from BETA's review was for ATR data from Russett and 18 Asheville, but no such data are presented; therefore, 19 the MDM report is nonresponsive to BETA's original 20 comment. 21 MDM cites additional traffic data from 2004 and 22 2013, but the specific dates in the studies are not 23 presented. Were they weekdays? School days? How 24 many days were actually studied?

The Comment Number 8 in MDM's response. BETA had 1 2 noted that since most of the proposed units will access the site via Asheville Road, the majority of traffic related to the proposed project will travel on 5 the residential streets of Asheville Road, Russett Road, and South Street. Asheville Road is 6 approximately 35 feet wide while Russett Road and South Street are both approximately 25 feet wide with on-street parking on both sides. Since the on-street 10 parking limits are available travel width, traffic 11 calming measures should be considered for the 12 roadways. 13 MDM's response states that the purpose of traffic 14 calming is to achieve slower speeds, reducing 15 collision frequency and severity, and increasing 16 safety for non-motorized users. They claim that 17 additional traffic calming measures are already in 18 place and additional measures are not warranted for 19 these streets. 20 In essence, MDM presents the argument that adding 21 substantial additional traffic is fine because the 22 streets are so small that people can't go fast 23 anyway. Both BETA and MDM miss the point that the 24 issue is that the streets are too small to accommodate

substantial additional traffic. On Russett, current 1 2 volume by MDM reporting is 65 and 50 by peak hour a.m. and p.m., and the expected new peak-hour trips are 34 and 43 a.m. to p.m., a 60 percent increase. In the 5 morning, increase will be to 99 cars per hour, which for a small essentially one-lane, two-way road is very substantial. The traffic consultants do not address the narrow width of the road, essentially single lane, and how this factors into the increased traffic The need is not traffic calming, but rather 10 volume. 11 traffic reduction. 12 Then the discussion about site lines and stuff --13 I wanted to mention about the nature of the busyness 14 on these roads, Russett and Bonad. It's not cars 15 stopping at stop signs and so on so much as the fact 16 that this a neighborhood full of children, given the 17 nature of this neighborhood, Baker School and so on. They're outside playing; they're on scooters; they're 18 on bikes. They often intrude upon the roadway. 19 20 must be three basketball baskets there where kids are 21 playing basketball on a nice day. Kids do 22 unpredictable things. That's really, I think, 23 ultimately the real concern here, in addition to just 24 the fact that there's just too many cars going back

and forth and it's hard to negotiate the street. 1 2 Comment 9. The trip distribution method is appropriate for this project, although some discrepancies in the travel patterns through the 5 residential streets from Asheville Street through the 6 study area may exist. What discrepancies that are alluded to? might these affect traffic projections? The MDM response indicates that the increase will range from fewer then 10 to just over 40 per hour, an increase 10 11 that will not materially impact neighborhood traffic 12 flow. The impact on Russett is greatest and is 13 between 30 to 40 cars per hour peak. Again, the 14 narrow width of Russett needs to be factored into the 15 impact. 16 On Comment 10, as MDM numbered them, BETA stated 17 that the proponent should commit to expanded or 18 additional TDM measures. Additional Zipcars on-site should be investigated; bike storage locations should 19 20 be provided throughout the site. In addition, the 21 Town should require a signed TDM agreement as part of 22 the permitting process in order to ensure that TDM 23 measures continue to exist into the future. 24 MDM's response is that Chestnut Hill Realty has a

1-800-325-3376

- 1 TDM for existing property and plans to expand it for
- 2 proposed development. They will contact Zipcar about
- 3 additional cars.
- First, there's an awful lot of talk about
- 5 Zipcar. There are only two of them.
- 6 Second, the response indicates no firm commitment
- 7 to any specific TDM. How much more bike storage? How
- 8 many more shuttle van trips? What schedule? How will
- 9 this be maintained and enforced.
- 10 And third, how does any of this mitigate the
- 11 effect of adding 140 parking spaces to the existing
- 12 167 that now empty onto Russet Road from the Asheville
- 13 Road connection? That's an 84 percent increase in
- vehicles which will necessarily result in an 84
- 15 percent increase in traffic and exiting through
- 16 Asheville Road onto Russett. What basis is there for
- any guest of the new residence and the new 192
- 18 apartments in the tower, for example, will use their
- vehicles any differently than existing residents who
- 20 enter and exit onto Asheville Road? People do not buy
- 21 and maintain automobiles to decorate parking lots.
- 22 Russett Road is at capacity now with vehicles and
- 23 pedestrians including children walking to and from
- 24 Baker School or to the bus stop to get to the high

Page 88

1 school. 2 Comment 15 on MDM's response. At a minimum, a new pavement striping plan should be investigated along Independence Drive to provide separate travel 5 lanes and shoulders. A Complete Streets design which would include bicycle facilities and separate parking 6 lanes should be investigated for the new cross section. This may include reducing Independence Drive to one lane of travel in both directions to accommodate a bicycle lane and parking lane. Analysis 10 11 should be conducted to determine the feasibility of 12 the implementation of Complete Streets design 13 concept. 14 BETA is suggesting making Independence Drive a 1.5 single lane in both directions requiring much 16 additional analysis to determine the impact on 17 traffic. Adjoining roads are, for the most part, two 18 lanes, so reducing the capacity of Independence would predictably create a traffic bottleneck. 19 20 consultant offered Route 16 in Wellesley as a shining 21 example, but those familiar with this road know it's a 2.2 dismal headache. 23 What is motivating the suggestion to make it 24 single lane? Does it have to do with increased volume

- of pedestrians and traffic from the proposed 1 2 development? The need to make these changes that will make the traffic worse indicates that the problem is that the infrastructure does not safely support this 5 expansion, and the proposed change will not be an 6 improvement. Comment 25. Currently, the roadway width along Asheville Road at the site is very narrow, which is only 18 feet. The proponent did recommend that it be widened to 22 feet; however, 24 feet is recommended. 10 11 MDM responded that it will be 22 feet, and that's all 12 that's needed. What is the reasoning behind the recommendation for 24 feet? What is the downside to 13 14 keeping it 22 feet or widening it to 24 feet? 1.5 not clear to us.
- Comment 31 referred to construction and traffic.

 MDM responded that there will be a construction

 management plan that addresses truck traffic. There

 will be removal of many truckloads of stone blasted

 from the site. Much of this will go down Russett Road

 which, as mentioned, is very narrow. The trucks will

 likely damage the road. The promise of a vague
- 24 are expected over what period of time? And how will

construction plan is not enough. How many truck trips

23

their impact be mitigated? 1 And further, regarding truck traffic on Russett 2 Road, we want to put on the record the fact that Russett Road has a commercial truck exclusion. No 5 commercial vehicle shall be operated at any time on Russett Road, in the traffic rules. There had been a 6 sign there for years, and it unaccountably disappeared some time ago. It's been since replaced since we brought this to the attention of the traffic department. The exclusion still exists, and the 10 11 traffic department recently installed a new sign. How 12 does this impact CHR's operating commercial vehicles 13 on Russett Road? It certainly hasn't had any impact 14 on them up until now. They routinely run their 1.5 service vehicles up and down Russett Road. 16 Intersection quality. Regarding the traffic 17 analysis, the MDM report commented upon intersection 18 quality in the neighborhood. Most of the intersections were rated a C while one was rated D. 19 20 Why is it rated D? In some towns, is it not required 21 that the minimum standard intersections affected by 22 construction be C? We really should not be aiming for 23 C or D, but better. There will be left turns across 24 Independence for cars coming down on the Beverly

They'll have to go onto Independence and to go 1 side. 2 up to Putterham and have to turn left, which means across a lane of traffic on Independence. That will be dangerous. 5 It would seem -- and this is the final remark -it would seem on the basis of MDM's nonresponsive 6 responses regarding traffic that the Town is expected to permit the degradation of traffic and pedestrian safety until we can achieve a higher average number of 10 collisions and injuries on neighborhood roadways. 11 On behalf of the neighborhood, thank you. 12 MR. GELLER: Thank you. 13 MR. TALERMAN: My name is Jay Talerman. 14 represent a number of the area residents. I've spoken 1.5 once before. I serve as town or special counsel to 16 several dozen towns and have represented hundreds of 17 towns on planning and zoning matters. I can tell you -- and I'm speaking only tonight 18 about the cul-de-sac and hammerhead issue -- that 19 20 nearly every single town that I've ever encountered 21 and ever worked with on zoning and planning prohibits lengthy cul-de-sacs and hammerheads, and they do it 22 23 not out of an issue -- they don't regulate it because 24 there might be sufficient turning radius.

design element. They limit it, design it, or regulate 1 2 it, prohibit it for the reasons that the fire department has already stated: There are concerns about appreciable delay or inability to get to a fire 5 due to single access, narrowness, blockage, and otherwise. 6 The issue that you have to take into consideration here isn't whether or not in a pure design element, a single fire vehicle -- the largest 10 vehicle -- can get there and navigate around a 11 circle. It's whether or not at night, in winter, in darkness, and when everyone's parked up on both sides 12 13 of the road and every parking space, and the road is 14 narrow or there may be blockage, can the fire 15 department get its ladder truck and its pumper truck 16 and its other truck -- it normally takes three 17 trucks -- to the site in a safe and effective way 18 where they can quickly, without delay, fight a fire in the last house down on the left? And invariably, the 19 20 answer from professional planners and professional 21 fire fighters is: We're concerned about that. 22 Will a fire department always try and get there? 23 Yeah, they will. Will they do a great job? 24 they will. But when you're talking about a fire and a

lot of smoke and of any appreciable delay, either at 1 that site or at another site where they can't back out and get out and get there, could mean harm, death, property damage or otherwise, and that's the reason 5 why we regulate these things. So you can look to nearly every single other town and a universal opinion, to my knowledge, of almost every planner that suggests that lengthy cul-de-sacs not be permitted. Now, they cite a few examples where there are some 10 cul-de-sacs. I can attest to you that there are 11 hundreds of examples where towns prohibit it and deny 12 cul-de-sacs, including area towns. 13 Now, I don't know what happens here in 14 Brookline. I think some of the examples are 1.5 inapplicable, but you've heard the chief himself or 16 the fire department themselves say that they're 17 concerned about some of the existing ones that were 18 approved. As another form of regulation, I think you have 19 20 to look to Housing Appeals Committee decisions 21 themselves. I mean, we know that the Housings Appeals 22 Committee isn't particularly kind to cities and towns 23 when it comes to these, but in recent years two of the 24 cases that have sided with towns -- practically the

only two cases that have sided with towns on a design 1 2 element -- are issues regarding single-access subdivisions. That's the OIB versus Braintree case and the Lexington Woods versus Waltham case, where the 5 Housing Appeals Committee expressly and emphatically upheld denials of comprehensive permits due to 6 concerns with single-access roadways. Their concerns are exactly the concerns that I've raised here and that the chief has already raised -- that there could be blockage and delay for emergency vehicles that 10 11 could result in harm or death in those situations. 12 Those cases provide ample precedent for you to look 13 at. 14 Now, whether or not at the end of the analysis 15 you agree that these facts meet those facts is a 16 question for you to all decide. What I'm suggesting 17 to you here tonight is there is a robust body of law, regulation, and HAC precedent to consider that and 18 19 keep that on the front burner. 20 At the end of the day, what you really have to 21 look at is what the chief thinks. He's the one that's 22 got to fight the fire. If he doesn't have a level of 23 confidence that he can safely navigate the roadway 24 system in a way where he can safely fight a fire with

- 1 his three required vehicles, you should take that very
- 2 seriously, and I hope you do going forward.
- 3 Thank you.
- 4 MS. SCHARF: Good evening. My name is Irene
- 5 Scharf. I'm an abutter on Russett Road, and I'm also
- 6 a Town Meeting Member, Precinct 16. I just have two
- 7 comments to make.
- From the MDM slide show, Slide Number 12, where
- 9 the person was discussing the possible expansion of
- 10 current services such as shuttles, bicycles, using
- 11 more sidewalks and Zipcars. I just want to point out
- 12 to the Board that the slide said Chestnut Hill Realty
- may expand current services -- shuttle, bikes,
- 14 sidewalks, Zipcar. During the testimony, the person
- 15 testifying said "would."
- I think it's really -- we all sit here
- patiently month after month. We're getting to the end
- 18 of this process. It's May. It's concerning to me and
- many of my neighbors that we have all of these "we may
- do this, " "we may do that, " "we may make a
- 21 compromise," "we may not do it." We really need --
- 22 this late in the game, given the tone that I'm hearing
- 23 from -- that I'm inferring from the questions from you
- 24 all and lack of questions, we need some commitments.

- 1 We don't need this to be a loosey-goosey thing where
- 2 approval is given and then, in the course of things,
- 3 there's all these questions that were not mandated to
- 4 be answered. So that was really one concern.
- 5 Secondly, a note I'm expressing from a neighbor.
- 6 There is suspicion that the traffic study was not
- 7 necessarily that legitimate, that maybe it was done
- 8 during April vacation, that 43 extra trips a day
- 9 cannot be accurate, that that would just encompass the
- 10 people who already live on the street. And so, just
- 11 basically, the point is, I guess, that it is unclear
- to people that the data that you're getting are not
- 13 being cherry-picked for the specific narrowly tailored
- 14 question that people are being asked to answer.
- 15 Thank you.
- MR. GELLER: Thank you.
- 17 MS. BURSTEIN. Hi. I'm Joni Burstein. I live on
- 18 South Street. Just three quick things.
- 19 One is the talk about cars turning onto VFW
- 20 Parkway from South Street or Russett Road or Bonad.
- 21 The visibility is cut down significantly, also, when
- there are snowbanks, and that's a good, significant
- 23 portion of the year, and that's part of the traffic
- study that wasn't mentioned by them, but only by

- 1 neighbors. So I think that that needs to be taken
- 2 into consideration.
- 3 Another aspect is on Independence. To me,
- 4 whenever I've driven there, the cars that park there
- 5 are parking there because they belong to Hancock
- 6 Village, so if they're changing the parking inside to
- 7 make parking for the people living there, it seems to
- 8 me to invite the possibility of making the road there
- 9 wider and accommodating more cars, not fewer, to
- 10 facilitate the flow of traffic. So instead of
- 11 narrowing it to one lane, keeping it at a point or
- even expanding it so that you can have two lanes in
- 13 each direction and cut down on the bottleneck that
- 14 Hancock Village expansion would create.
- And my phone shut off, so I don't remember my
- 16 third point.
- 17 MR. GELLER: Thank you.
- 18 MS. KOOCHER: Hi. I'm Robin Koocher. I live on
- 19 Beverly Road, and I've lived there for 37 years.
- Just a couple of comments in terms of traffic on
- 21 Independence Drive. What I heard in terms of the
- 22 traffic study was that they were talking about the
- peak hour in the evening from 4:00 to 6:00. I drive
- down Independence from Beverly to VFW quite

frequently, and I can tell you that rush hour does not 1 2 begin at 4:00. It begins around 3:15, 3:30, and that's when the backup begins, and it can be quite substantial. So, again, in terms of their exact 5 two-hour window, I would suggest that that's not written in stone. The second thing -- and it was mentioned briefly, but there hasn't really been a lot of comments regarding the new driveways which would run parallel 10 from Beverly and Russett. As was mentioned, those 11 people who want to take a left turn from the Russett 12 side or Beverly Road side are going to be turning 13 against traffic. They're also going to be turning, 14 depending on which side you're talking about, 400 feet 15 or approximately 230 feet from the traffic signal at 16 the intersection of Independence, Beverly, and 17 Russett. Now, I can't believe that any traffic expert would say that that would be a safe thing to do, and 18 add to it, as a former speaker mentioned, doing that 19 20 during high-volume times or even on the weekends. 21 I would like to say that I drive down Russett 22 Road frequently to visit friends, to get to VFW a 23 different way, and I can tell you that on the 24 weekends, there's traffic, and the traffic coming down

from Asheville, from the current Hancock Village 1 2 property, these people are flying. I notice this on a Saturday, on a Sunday; others have mentioned that it's during the week. So, again, this is an observation by 5 a citizen, but it's real, and, you know, the four-way stop might be interesting to do, but I'm not convinced that that would stop, and it does have to do with the gradation, the 8 percent, et cetera. The last thing I wanted to mention was that there's been no discussion in terms of what happens 10 with snow, narrowing Beverly and Russett Road 11 further. I can tell you that this past winter, as we 12 13 all know, was a pretty miserable winter. There was a 14 lot of snow, and Beverly Road becomes one-way from 1.5 before the first flake falls until April 15, and it 16 becomes one-way from Lagrange down Beverly to that 17 light intersection of Russett, Beverly, and 18 Independence. 19 Several years ago, when we had ice storms, 20 parents were having great difficulty parking to pick 21 up their children despite the fact that salt and sand 22 had been put on the walkways, so I would just say to 23 you in terms of emergency vehicles, again, I think 24 that presents a problem which I don't think has been

- 1 addressed to the satisfaction of the neighborhood.
- 2 Thank you.
- 3 MR. GELLER: Thank you.
- 4 Is there anybody else who wants to speak at this
- 5 time? Seeing nobody, I want to call on the
- 6 representative from BETA and see if he can respond to
- 7 some of the questions that have been asked tonight. I
- 8 saw you taking notes.
- 9 MR. BEISEL: You're supposed to call on MDM right
- 10 now.
- MR. GELLER: Does MDM want to go?
- MR. BEISEL: No, no, no. I'm just kidding.
- I wrote down a bunch trying to keep up. I'll try
- 14 to remember my notes. I'm going to go in reverse
- order because I remember those clearer right now.
- 16 I'll figure out the rest.
- 17 The first one is the last comment I had is that
- the MDM response does not fully commit to TDM
- 19 measures, and I completely agree. In my letter from
- 20 today, which I'm sure the public hasn't seen, in the
- 21 last page in the conclusion of the recommendations I
- 22 say, "An official commitment to the TDM measures
- 23 should be enacted (expanding the shuttle service,
- 24 providing on-site bike storage, and expanding Zipcar

supply if demand is needed). The Town should require 1 2 a signed TDM agreement as part of this permitting process." So I completely agree on that. It does need to 5 be more of a commitment. How that becomes official is usually in approval process, so that's something I 6 recommend the Board follow. Along those lines, as well as the construction 9 management, the Board should also include a commitment -- or not a commitment, but they should --10 11 you should have the proponent provide you with a 12 construction management plan that would include the 13 number of trucks that will haul gravel off the site --14 or not the gravel, but the blasted ledge, and just 1.5 trucks in general. Of course, that number can't be determined right now because the site plan is still 16 17 being discussed. We had a question about the grading of the site, 18 and people think 10 percent is too extreme. 19 That is a 20 comment that is in our site plan letter, and it's 21 still ongoing. Basically, BETA was hired for traffic 22 review and for site and stormwater evaluation, so our 23 civil/stormwater management review letter is dated 24 April 2nd, and in there it discusses the fact we don't

like the 10 percent grade, and there's also a side 1 2 slope. That is something that the civil engineers in my office are working on with Stantec who's the site engineer. That is still ongoing, and we need more 5 information for that. I can't speak as an expert to it other than 10 percent grade is steep, but it is 6 allowed. There's things that can be done to flatten it too. Another comment was made about the end of Asheville Road. Currently it's less -- as you exit 10 11 the site, it's less than -- the width is less than the 12 rest of Asheville Road, and I believe at the last 13 meeting, it was said that 24 is standard. Where that 14 came from is that for years traffic engineers have 1.5 said a 12-foot lane is the standard width of travel 16 lane. That is based on highway. If you're on the 17 highway doing 55, you want 12-feet widths per lane, so you get 12 plus 12 is 24 for two-way traffic. 18 19 We're now finding that urban design, and local 20 roadway design more specifically in this case, doesn't 21 need such wide roadways, and in fact, it increases 22 speeds because of the extra width. So I would 23 recommend 22 feet, if not 21 feet, 20 feet. 24 no reason to go to 24 feet in this case. It does

1-800-325-3376

nothing but increase speed or encourage increased 1 2 speeding, and as they're coming down the hill, obviously, that's the last thing we need to do. Someone said we shouldn't be talking about 5 traffic calming, we should be talking about traffic reduction, and the point of traffic calming is to 6 reduce traffic volume on streets. The issue here is because of the web of streets, where do we want to push them, as we discussed before. It's not as simple as put traffic calming here and that solves all the 10 11 problems. We need to look at the whole area, and go 12 from there. 13 Trip distribution discrepancy. Bob, if you want 14 to pull up the graphics there. I made a comment in my 15 first letter that said there are some discrepancies. When a car leaves Asheville Road and leaves the 16 17 site in the morning, they have 18 vehicles making a right there which, of course, gets them to VFW. They 18 would have to make a right onto VFW. Well, that sends 19 20 them outbound. 21 So my discrepancy is that 18 should actually be a through, and then you see here, there's only 3 22 23 vehicles making a right. Well, that's saying that 24 only 3 people are leaving here and then heading

inbound on VFW. So my argument is that the 18 and the 1 2 3 should be switched. It doesn't make a material difference, which is why I did not discuss it more in detail in the letter. It would have been wordy and 5 difficult to explain without the graphic. It's not going to change the findings of the study. 6 Along those lines, the site distance here at the signalized intersection of South Street is limited, but there is a traffic signal there. So site distance 10 is not an issue. Bonad Road and Russett Road, they're 11 right turn only, and they're also limited site 12 distance. There's no way to correct that other than 13 closing those two roads, and I don't think that's what 14 the neighborhood's looking for. 1.5 Beverly Road, it was mentioned that it's one way 16 during school season. The traffic counts were done 17 during that period. That is the situation that exists 18 for more than half the year. I'd rather that 19 situation be analyzed than the situation during the 20 summer when it's two ways. This is the prominent 21 situation is that it's one way out of here during 22 school hours, and that is how it was done. 23 It was quickly mentioned that the counts were 24 done during school vacation week. I can't remember

exactly what -- it was April, so it would have been 1 2 Easter -- or spring break. It was done on the Wednesday before school vacation. I wouldn't be thrilled with Thursday traffic from that day because 5 maybe people leave early, but the week before school vacation, especially Tuesday or Wednesday, is acceptable data, and it wasn't during the actual vacation week. We would never accept traffic volumes from Friday or Monday, unless, you know, there's specific situations, not for a residential 10 11 development. 12 It was discussed about the 85th percentile speed, 13 and as the neighbors were giving their comments, I 14 actually looked through the appendix again to make 15 sure I didn't miss anything, and the 85th percentile 16 speed does not fluctuate throughout the day. It might 17 give the impression that people were driving very slow, but the radar detection that was out there does 18 not show a spike in travel speeds after parking is 19 20 banned on the street at night. 21 The satellite parking is an existing issue, and 22 it is an issue. People can't park right next to their 23 building in a lot of cases. The future buildings 24 actually don't have that problem. That's something I

looked at very closely because sometimes, on a site 1 2 like this, people will just put parking where they can and not near the buildings. In this case, there's actually more than two spaces per unit, along here, 5 along here, and along here. The one place where it is a little less than the 1.4 or 1.5 that I like to see is in the garage of the main unit, so those people will have to either walk to the parking here or the parking over here. They do, however, for groceries have a drop-off aisle over here, so the double 10 parking, as far as I can see at this point, is not an 11 12 issue, and actually this parking is designed better 13 than the existing parking. 14 Route 16 in Wellesley -- again, this must have 15 come up at the last hearing -- is a terrible example 16 in this case. It's a nightmare. The similarities 17 that we put in, the flashing pedestrian beacon on the side of the road, the volume on Route 16 on one lane 18 is extremely higher than the volume on Independence 19 20 Drive. They're not even comparable. 21 The only similarity is that we have a similar 22 pedestrian activation sign like that that was put in 23 as part of mitigation for the redevelopment of the 24 Grossman site. So as you're coming through Lower

Falls where the CVS is now and the independent living 1 2 is in the back, there's a mid-block pedestrian crossing that has these pedestrian-activated signals. Other than that, the traffic volume is much 5 worse, and because I worked on that study, the other issue with 16 -- and especially in the morning as 6 you're leaving Wellesley getting to 128 -- is that the Concord Avenue intersection is actually in Newton, and that light, as I said before, is old. It has no actuation; it's pre-timed. It's terrible. 10 11 mitigation actually -- the development had to give 12 money to the city of Newton for them to upgrade that 13 signal, and I don't think that's happened yet. 14 So a lot of the issues with that corridor is 15 because of that signal, and it's one of the ones that 16 drives me nuts. 17 The trip-generates. It was discussed that it's 18 1.7 per unit and how do they get home. The 1.7 is what falls within the peak hour. The neighbor that 19 20 used that example said he walked to the T to commute 21 to work, so he doesn't have any trip; or he could go 22 to work early, and he wouldn't be in during the peak 23 hour; or he would return during the peak hour. So the 24 1.7 is just what occurs during the peak hours, and I'm

- 1 $\,$ not exactly sure of the number off the top of my
- 2 head.
- 3 Throughout the course of the day, a unit will
- 4 generate on average ten vehicle trips and that means
- 5 five trips -- one unit will generate five trips out
- 6 and five trips in. That's people leaving to go to
- 7 work, going shopping, school; so the average is pretty
- 8 high.
- 9 In this case, I wouldn't expect that since there
- is actually the extra transportation option, so I
- 11 wouldn't expect the ten, but they did use that because
- 12 that is the standard.
- 13 Someone said that the speed data and the volume
- 14 data for the local roads -- Russett Road, Asheville
- Road, and Bonad Road -- weren't provided in the
- 16 response. They're not in the letter of the response,
- but they're in the appendix. It's very tedious to go
- 18 through it, but they are in there, and the volumes are
- 19 summarized in one of the slides, but they are in
- 20 there.
- 21 The course of the day. It would be great if we
- 22 had ongoing traffic monitoring, but we don't. We
- 23 typically use one day. The adjustments -- September
- and April are both actually higher than average.

School is in session. It's nice weather. 1 2 comparing September and April volumes from different years is comparable. If they would have done, say, September in 2007 5 and compared it to February of 2014, then, yes, that would have shown -- the growth that could have 6 potentially happened would have been hidden by the fact that the seasonality reduces the volumes, but comparing September and April is legitimate. 10 I think that's all of the ones I wrote down. 11 MR. GELLER: The question was asked whether there 12 should have been a review at the South Street/VFW 13 interchange. 14 Right. There is a signal there at MR. BEISEL: 1.5 that intersection. The site, as I was just saying, 16 they're setting, according to this graphic, they're 17 only setting 3. I suggest it's 18. In either case, 18 the operations at this signal are not going to change because of 18 vehicles or 3 vehicles. The volume on 19 20 VFW is what drives the operations of that signal, 21 basically, regardless of what's coming down South 22 Street. Adding 18 vehicles or 3 vehicles isn't going 23 to all of a sudden create this massive long queue on 24 South Street to access VFW. So that's why we didn't

request that it be included in the study area. 1 MR. GELLER: You have the same response on 2 Russett Road? MR. BEISEL: Yeah. The problem with Russett Road 5 is that it's right in and right out only, so the analyses are going to tell you that it operates 6 wonderfully and there's not much conflict there, and there's also -- there's no way to fix that intersection with the site-distance issues that exist, like I said, other than closing it. 10 11 In some cases, intersections were left out of the 12 study area because we knew what the results of 13 studying would have been, so we didn't request it. 14 MR. GELLER: Do you have a comment on narrowness 15 on Russett Road? 16 MR. BEISEL: Yeah. Like I said before, it goes 17 both ways. The on-street parking and the narrowness 18 reduces speeds. It reduces the appealness of the street. If you remove parking on one side, you're 19 20 really only encouraging more vehicles, more speed. 21 there really is an issue with two cars parked on the 22 street and emergency vehicles not being able to get 23 through, that's an existing issue, and that's

something I think the Town should rectify with or

24

without this project. But short of that, I wouldn't 1 2 recommend opening the road up, essentially, to more people and more speed. MR. GELLER: Do you have a comment on -- it's 5 been suggested that the lengthy cul-de-sacs and the hammerheads -- it's been suggested both by the fire 6 department, but also by Mr. Talerman, that these are 8 not acceptable methods in most towns. Is that a fair statement, Mr. Talerman? MR. TALERMAN: Yes. 10 11 MR. BEISEL: I don't have experience where a project was shot down specifically for that. 12 13 I actually was the traffic engineer for the OIB 14 in Braintree. We didn't do the site design. I wasn't 15 at BETA at the time. We had a traffic hearing such as this, and then, afterwards, the site plan design which 16 17 evidently killed the project. I wasn't involved in I didn't know until tonight that that's what 18 killed the project. I just knew that it died. 19 20 It's not -- it seems like it's a transportation 21 issue. It's not a traffic issue. It's really more of

a site plan issue. I would work with our civil

engineers, but as far as I'm aware, they're not

desirable by the fire department, but I don't have a

22

23

24

- 1 transportation standard that says you can't do it as
- 2 the AASHTO graphic showed. A lot of times, these
- 3 standards aren't what the public are looking for, but,
- 4 unfortunately, it's what I have to rely on.
- 5 Someone made the comment of the intersection is a
- 6 Level of Service C, and we should be asking for
- 7 better. Well, if you're asking for a Level of Service
- 8 B, why aren't you asking for a Level of Service A? I
- 9 have a standard of anything that's Level of Service D
- 10 or better is acceptable. It might not be acceptable
- 11 to the residents. I'm not trying to change their
- 12 mind, but those are the standards that I have to
- 13 follow.
- MR. GELLER: One last question, and you may have
- answered this already, but I just need to ask.
- 16 The suggestion has been made a couple of times
- 17 that the data was cherry-picked.
- 18 MR. BEISEL: Like I said, all of the data that
- 19 they collected is in the back. They present averages
- in some cases, 85th percentile in some cases. Some of
- 21 the summaries might be done to make it look rosy for
- 22 them, but all of the data is there. I did go through
- 23 all of the data. They didn't pick an arbitrary number
- that was an anomaly, that everything looked great for

this one day or this one hour. It is pretty 1 2 consistent through the area since it is local roadways for the most part. People do tend to do the same thing throughout each day, so I didn't see any 5 evidence of cherry-picking. They might not have highlighted the worst parts, but they are in there in 6 the appendix, and I know what to look for so... MR. GELLER: Great. Thank you. Other questions? MR. BOOK: Yeah, I have just one. In terms of the -- it's actually a follow-up to a question that I 10 11 asked earlier. In terms of directing the traffic off of Russett or Bonad, do you have any thoughts of doing 12 13 peak travel times prohibiting left-hand turns off of 14 Asheville, and that way it'll force people to South 15 Street? 16 MR. BEISEL: Right. Usually left-turn 17 restrictions are not favorable because what you end up doing -- I'll use the driveway as a better example, 18 and then I'll answer your question more specifically. 19 20 If you use the west driveway here -- or it's not 21 showing in this picture. If you restrict left turns 22 out of that driveway, someone's just going to make a 23 right out of there and then they're either going to 24 U-turn or they're going to come through here and then

- 1 make a left here, so you're not ever going to really
- 2 change the movement in a situation like that.
- In this case, if, say, it didn't allow left turns
- 4 here, you would force people through. It would work
- 5 as much as it got enforced, to be honest with you.
- 6 People don't look at signs. They don't follow signs.
- 7 They look at them and ignore them unless they're
- 8 worried that ignoring them is going to lead to a
- 9 ticket. So that's really up to you and the Town. If
- 10 that's the way you want to go, that is one way you'd
- 11 be able to push traffic in certain areas this way or
- 12 onto certain roads, but it has to be enforced or
- 13 you're really not going to accomplish anything.
- MR. GELLER: Anything else? No? Do you want to
- 15 add anything?
- 16 MR. MICHAUD: No. I commend Mr. Beisel on his
- 17 responses, and I concur.
- 18 MR. BEISEL: One other thing. When the parking
- 19 ratios came up, my goal is 1.4. Some people say
- that's not enough. Other people say you should have
- 21 it lower so you can encourage less parking. I think
- the view of encouraging is great, but if you don't
- supply enough parking, then it's going to lead to
- 24 safety issues. The 1.4 seems aggressive to some

- 1 people, and it's not aggressive enough for other
- 2 people. To me, you really have to weigh the options
- 3 or weigh the balances of the two, of what you're
- 4 trying to accomplish and what's realistic to happen,
- 5 and that depends on the area.
- 6 MR. BOOK: You had just said that not providing
- 7 enough parking creates a safety issue?
- 8 MR. BEISEL: Well, you'll have people parking on
- 9 the internal roadways and not in a parking space if
- 10 there's not enough parking. If there's more cars than
- 11 parking spaces, they're going to find somewhere to put
- 12 it. That's what you want to avoid.
- 13 At the same time, I don't know -- no offense, I
- don't agree with your zoning bylaw of two spaces per
- unit in this area. That's seems too high. That's
- 16 just too much asphalt and not necessary, but you also
- shouldn't just say, "Well, let's do one space per
- unit, and people won't drive." Certain people are
- 19 going to drive no matter what. Some people don't have
- a choice; some people are driving no matter what, even
- 21 if they have a choice. So it's really a balance of
- the two.
- MR. BOOK: Thank you.
- MR. GELLER: Thank you. I want to thank everyone

for participating this evening. Your comments have 1 2 been very helpful and certainly something we will continue to think about as we review this project. This hearing is going to be continued until the next 5 public hearing which we have scheduled for May the 20th, at which point it may include a presentation by 6 the applicant of an alternative plan, but I would note that this hearing may be rescheduled, if necessary, to a later date. So please keep on eye on the postings to either confirm that we will hold that hearing as 10 11 planned. Should that hearing be continued, we'll be 12 lucky enough to be able to sit here for 30 seconds and 13 continue the hearing. 14 MR. HUSSEY: I have a question. I understand 1.5 that there is an architectural firm that has been 16 retained as a peer study? 17 MR. GELLER: Peer review. AUDIENCE MEMBERS: We can't hear. 18 MR. HUSSEY: Sorry. I understand that there has 19 20 been an architectural firm retained to do a peer 21 review, and how does that fit into this alternative plan that may be presented? Are we going to hear that 22 architect before then or after? Well, not before, 23 24 clearly.

MR. GELLER: My understanding is that a peer 1 2 reviewer and design reviewer has been engaged, and that process is continuing. That will not be ready by May 20th, so this will not include a discussion or 5 review of whatever the comments are from that peer reviewer. It is unfortunate, but that's the way it is. MR. HUSSEY: Thank you. MR. BOOK: So past the May 20th date, do we know what the next date would be now? Can we announce 10 11 that, or is that yet to be decided? 12 MR. GELLER: June 5th is the scheduled date after 13 that. 14 MR. BOOK: So if the May 20th date is postponed, 15 the next date -- it wouldn't be a date earlier than June 5th? It would be June 5th? 16 17 MR. GELLER: It would be June 5th. That is 18 correct, and we would obviously continue it on the 19 20th to the 5th. 20 MR. ZUROFF: If we don't meet on the 20th --21 MR. GELLER: No, you will be meeting on the 20th. 22 MR. ZUROFF: If we meet on the 20th, is the 5th 23 definitely the next meeting? 24 MR. GELLER: Yes. Hopefully, we will see all of

```
1
      you on the 20th. Thank you very much.
           (Proceedings suspended at 9:34 p.m.)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

```
CERTIFICATE
 1
 2
           I, Barbara J. Vican, Court Reporter and Notary
      Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
      certify:
 4
           That the foregoing proceedings were taken before
 5
      me at the time and place herein set forth and that the
 6
      foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my
      shorthand notes so taken.
           Dated this 16th day of May, 2014.
10
11
12
13
14
                 Barbara J. Vican, Notary Public
15
16
17
18
      My Commission expires March 12, 2021.
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	ı	I	I
A	activation	adhere	alignment
AASHTO	106:22	70:7	26:21
36:9 37:6 112:2	activity	Adjoining	Alison
ability	13:24 23:18 25:2 35:5	88:17	2:13 4:23 5:1
19:22 78:24	actual	adjustment	alleviate
able	10:21 12:23 13:22	61:12	54:9
51:24 60:12 110:22	37:22 54:22 70:21	adjustments	allow
114:11 116:12	105:7	108:23	14:24 24:14 31:4
absolute	actuation	Administration	40:21 60:6 70:18
55:23	107:10	61:16	114:3
abut	ADA	advisable	allowed
30:14	72:2	48:9	102:7
abutter	add	advisory-type	allowing
95:5	8:9 38:3 51:14,21,23	28:11	54:1
accept	54:16 71:1 72:17	affect	alluded
105:8	74:4 98:19 114:15	73:10 86:8	86:7
acceptable	adding	affluent	all-way
36:4 105:7 111:8	71:12,17 84:20 87:11	59:18	16:4 22:13,22 23:6,13
112:10,10	109:22	afternoon	33:5 42:10
accepted	addition	38:8 54:19,21	alternating
28:13 30:12 61:10	25:3 49:13,15 78:24	agency	67:8 70:4
	85:23 86:20	61:11	alternative
accepted-equipment 28:14	additional	aggressive	5:9 116:7,21
	6:2 7:13 9:4 15:1	46:5 50:19 114:24	American
access 17:6 20:20 29:23	18:14 23:12 41:21	115:1	36:8
30:17 47:1 71:22	48:11 50:13,14 51:5	ago	amount
84:3 92:5 109:24	52:23 57:14 69:10	90:8 99:19	5:6,7 71:16
accessed	70:10 71:12 83:21	agree	ample
19:3	84:17,18,21 85:1	57:21 62:24 94:15	19:23 30:4,8,8 94:12
accidents	86:18,18 87:3 88:16	100:19 101:4 115:14	analyses
44:9 64:22 68:19	address	agreed	68:7 110:6
77:14 79:24	15:3 85:7	4:18	analysis
	addressed	agreement	20:2,7,8 27:18 29:20
accommodate	33:13 34:14,19 75:19	7:21 40:12 86:21	29:21 30:7 32:12,17
25:10 30:4,9 84:24	78:23 100:1	101:2	33:6 37:17,20,24
88:10	addresses	ahead	39:1,15 48:11 68:6,9
accommodating	89:18	58:8	75:11,15 88:10,16
97:9	addressing	aiming	90:17 94:14
accomplish	77:13	90:22	analyze
114:13 115:4	adds	aisle	55:12
accurate	54:17	106:10	analyzed
96:9	adequacy	aisles	72:12 104:19
achieve	59:9	35:19	anecdotally
36:18 84:14 91:9	adequate	Alert	62:7
activated	12:5 62:15 63:6	28:11	annotation
28:4,4,18	12.5 02.15 05.0	20,11	umvuuvu
	I	I	l

15:16	35:23	area	18:6
announce	applicable	area 8:12 12:20 14:14 26:9	assigned
117:10	35:2	30:4 36:3 42:13	18:22
announcements	applicant	57:17 61:24 63:5,16	Associate
4:11	4:18 5:8 6:20 7:3 22:2	64:6 65:19,20 66:1	2:6,7
annual	22:5 23:5,20 25:13	70:17 76:20 78:14	Associates
9:17 20:5 22:5 37:22	33:8 116:7	81:9 83:2 86:6 91:14	2:12
	applicants	93:12 103:11 110:1	Association
anomaly 112:24	8:21	110:12 113:2 115:5	36:8
	applicant's	110.12 113.2 113.3	
answer 31:2 47:4 49:7,11	5:23	areas	assume 38:18 51:16 57:5
50:23 51:1,19 58:9	application	8:23 31:10 35:8 36:19	79:22
59:3 92:20 96:14	1:7 21:11,14 29:6,12	68:19 72:5 74:4	assumption
113:19	31:23	114:11	10:7 20:6
answered			assumptions
53:23 96:4 112:15	applied 33:12	argument 84:20 104:1	9:9 18:17
answers 60:14	appreciable 92:4 93:1	arm 45:18	assuring 34:12
			34:12 ATR
anticipating	approach	Asheville	
21:1	22:11 26:1 28:19	2:23 8:19 16:8 17:5	82:24 83:7,17
anybody	32:13 45:7 59:23	19:3,9 20:24 22:11	ATRs
58:10 80:4 100:4	appropriate	23:7 31:20,20 42:10	38:22
anymore	8:14 14:9,19 15:2 23:7	49:6,10 50:4 62:20	attached
48:23 74:15 77:2	27:1,24 35:4 39:1	62:21 64:10 67:7	66:7
anyway	47:9,15 86:3	69:13 70:20 71:5,21	attempt
84:23	appropriately	71:24 78:6 79:11	82:6
an-hour	23:16	80:24 83:4,18 84:3,5	attempting
17:11	appropriateness	84:6 86:5 87:12,16	81:17
apartment	35:24	87:20 89:8 99:1	attention
5:8	approval	102:10,12 103:16	90:9
apartments	96:2 101:6	108:14 113:14	attest
87:18	approved	asked	62:7 93:10
apex	37:2,13 93:18	16:20 32:22 33:20	AUDIENCE
55:23	approximately	53:23 57:17 59:9	116:18
apologize	84:7,8 98:15	80:8 96:14 100:7	augment
7:6	April	109:11 113:11	8:6
appealness	83:8 96:8 99:15	askew	augmented
110:18	101:24 105:1 108:24	26:17	24:17
Appeals	109:2,9	asking	August
1:5 93:20,21 94:5	arbitrary	6:10 112:6,7,8	4:20
APPEARANCES	112:23	aspect	automated
2:1 3:1	architect	17:12 97:3	39:2
appendix	116:23	asphalt	automobiles
105:14 108:17 113:7	architectural	115:16	87:21
applicability	116:15,20	assessment	AutoTURN

	I_		l
29:20 46:18,21	bags	46:3,13 106:17	Beverly
available	72:22	beacons	3:6 9:1 17:10 18:1
84:10	Baker	24:19,21 25:19 27:23	19:14 25:16,23 26:16
Avenue	9:2 13:10 18:1 21:22	28:17,21 45:12,17	56:6,11 65:22 66:2,3
37:12 107:8	26:20 69:2 71:15	46:9,10	74:12 90:24 97:19,24
average	78:12 85:17 87:24 Baker's	beacon-type 34:8	98:10,12,16 99:11,14 99:16,17 104:15
11:2 12:22,24 13:18 13:19 16:18 19:13	31:4	beautiful	<i>'</i>
23:18 54:16,22 67:20	balance	65:9	beyond 13:10 15:7 23:13
67:24 81:7 91:9	115:21	begins	bicycle
108:4,7,24	balances	98:2,3	25:5,12 27:10 88:6,10
averages	115:3	behalf	bicycles
67:22 112:19	banned	6:19 58:5 91:11	74:23 95:10
Avi	105:20	Beisel	bicycle-storage
2:7 4:8	Barbara	2:15 7:4,5 47:10,17	21:15
avoid	1:18 119:2,14	48:16 49:19 51:12	bicyclist
35:9 59:12 62:5	base	52:10 53:7 54:3,24	43:20 44:1,24
115:12	39:10	56:4 57:3,6,16 100:9	bicyclists
aware	baseball	100:12 109:14 110:4	14:3 44:9
9:2 28:23 57:19,19	76:24	110:16 111:11	big
61:6 111:23	based	112:18 113:16	44:5,5 70:11
awful	6:8 7:2 10:6 14:10	114:16,18 115:8	bigger
87:4	18:6 21:12 22:12	believe	46:23
a.m	23:2,17 30:18 33:8	13:11 18:9 22:1 23:11	bike
55:2 85:2,4	33:20 34:2 39:7	60:13 98:17 102:12	14:15 35:19 43:8,13
B	48:10 59:17 67:20	bell	43:15,17,24 44:4,7
B	83:16 102:16	55:24	44:17,18 74:4,10,11
20:13,17 112:8	baseline	belong	74:18,20 86:19 87:7
back	9:6 14:23	97:5	100:24
9:24 25:21,24 26:3	basically 40:15 42:22 50:15	BETA	bikes 64:18 85:19 95:13
29:7 35:22 41:3	67:8 74:16 96:11	2:15 5:19,24 7:5,10,14 7:22 8:9 10:17 12:8	bit
43:24 61:1,2 66:10	101:21 109:21	14:7,18 15:12 16:20	26:22 38:11 50:21
72:9 73:20,21,24	basis	20:2 21:4 26:24	54:14
76:4 78:20 81:19	5:17,22 8:8 11:15 12:1	27:16 29:14,17,20	blasted
82:3 85:24 93:2	14:20 18:10 22:5	33:14 34:15,20 35:17	89:19 101:14
107:2 112:19	87:16 91:6	37:19 82:24 84:1,23	blasting
backing	basketball	86:16 88:14 100:6	75:8
30:11 36:3 61:3	85:20,21	101:21 111:15	Blatman
backtracking	baskets	BETA's	3:3
54:14	85:20	82:16,22 83:17,19	blinking
backup	beach	better	80:14
60:20 98:3	80:14	24:2 48:10,12 54:1	blockage
bad	beacon	55:14 90:23 106:12	92:5,14 94:10
40:19 48:8	25:19 28:11 45:3,4,8	112:7,10 113:18	blow

	•	1	i
70:10 79:17,19	Braintree	76:22 105:23	calming
blows	94:3 111:14	buildings	10:23 14:20 15:2,19
76:20	break	29:15 105:23 106:3	15:23 16:5,11 18:12
blue	105:2	built	23:9,15,16 40:22
43:2,2	breaks	69:2 77:2	41:7,8,11,12,22 42:2
Bluestein	73:11	bump	42:3,20 48:5,18,22
2:10	BREISEL	35:19 74:13	49:20 52:17,23 53:3
blurt	38:4	bumps	69:9,11,19 74:5
6:4	Brian	69:21	84:11,14,17 85:10
Board	2:15 7:4 8:10 38:2	bump-out	103:5,6,10
1:5 2:2,21 6:2,24 7:13	brick	43:21	capability
7:23 42:6 95:12	27:13	bump-outs	22:7
101:7,9	bridge	24:12 25:17 27:10	capacity
Bob	75:21	bunch	19:23 20:2,8,13 37:17
38:9,15 40:6 43:9	briefly	100:13	37:24 70:17 74:16
46:18 57:21 103:13	98:7	burner	87:22 88:18
Bobrowski	Brighton	76:5 94:19	capture
3:3	47:22	burning	16:16
body	bring	78:22	car
94:17	69:2 74:23	Burstein	32:9 33:23,23 43:2
Bonad	bringing	3:5 96:17,17	44:2,13 47:24 51:21
9:1 16:2 17:3,19 19:2	75:23	bus	51:22 56:21 64:24
33:1 41:13,22 42:16	brings	14:16 47:21,22,23	67:13 73:5 78:16,18
48:20 49:4 52:9 62:3	25:21 38:8	87:24	103:16
62:6,9 64:2 67:7	broken	busiest	care
78:7 85:14 96:20	64:24	24:5	75:7
104:10 108:15	Brookline	busyness	carpool
113:12	1:5,8,12 2:19 4:5	85:13	21:8
book	30:13,14 36:6,22	button	carry
2:4 4:7 6:14,18 36:10	39:17 47:19,19 58:7	24:20,22 28:6,20	72:22
47:6,13 48:3 49:13	60:16 63:13 64:6	64:23	cars
77:11 113:9 115:6,23	65:16 67:14 74:23	buy	21:7 43:2 52:6,18
117:9,14	77:24 93:14	87:20	54:16,17 56:14 59:18
Boston	brother	bylaw	59:20 65:12,14 66:1
32:8 43:5 56:10 57:18	53:5	115:14	67:11,14,15 68:3
63:14,22 65:5 74:20	brought		69:14 70:2 73:12
77:3,23	90:9	<u>C</u>	77:11 78:4,8,10
Boston-based	buffer	C	80:17,22 81:14 85:5
32:17	44:14,15	2:13 20:13,17 90:19	85:14,24 86:13 87:3
bothers	buffers	90:22,23 112:6	90:24 96:19 97:4,9
72:14,15 76:17	62:16	call	110:21 115:10
bottleneck	build	4:22 11:7 15:22 36:12	case
88:19 97:13	20:10	100:5,9	1:6 28:16 37:20 39:12
bottoming	building	calls	41:15 44:17,18 46:11
69:15	5:3,8 30:24 31:1,11	59:20	53:16 54:10 55:11,16

56:16,17 94:3,4	96:13 112:17	citizens	39:22 66:19 83:4,5
102:20,24 106:3,16	cherry-picking	58:21	112:19
108:9 109:17 114:3	113:5	city	collection
cases	Chestnut	57:18 77:22 107:12	10:16
20:14 36:13 93:24	1:7 2:20 5:5 33:24	civil	collector
94:1,12 105:23	59:8 86:24 95:12	63:8 102:2 111:22	41:12
110:11 112:20,20	chicane	civil/stormwater	collector/distributor
census	15:21 50:16 52:19	101:23	17:23
14:13	chief	claim	collision
center	2:18 58:6 61:13 62:14	84:16	84:15
26:14	93:15 94:9,21	clarification	collisions
certain	children	29:2 38:12	91:10
41:9 114:11,12 115:18	53:22 68:22 69:2,5	clarify	color
certainly	76:24 77:6,10 85:16	60:5	13:7 27:13
6:6 27:2 33:9,24 65:24	87:23 99:21	clarifying	combination
90:13 116:2	Chiumenti	18:17,19	26:24
CERTIFICATE	3:2 82:11,11	clear	combined
119:1	choice	47:7 89:15	7:16
certify	77:3 115:20,21	clearer	come
119:4	choose	100:15	16:5 40:16 66:3 69:16
cetera	52:21	clearly	70:3,19 72:20 73:19
99:8	Chris	116:24	73:21,24 79:14,18
Chairman	4:7	close	80:7 106:15 113:24
2:3 5:1 6:14,23	Christopher	47:21 78:18 79:14	comes
change	2:5	closely	37:3 93:23
20:9,17 21:2 56:13	CHR's	106:1	comfortable
76:10 80:5 89:5	90:12	closer	52:18
104:6 109:18 112:11	circle	77:24	coming
114:2	30:2,10 92:11	closing	50:2 65:4,5,12,14
changed	circles	104:13 110:10	69:13 78:12 80:23
62:15,16	68:24 69:5	CMP	81:1,16 90:24 98:24
changes	circular	35:9	103:2 106:24 109:21
42:23 57:9,13 65:24	36:13	code	commend
89:2	circulation	70:1,6	114:16
changing	29:18 30:18 46:16	coded	comment
76:6,8 97:6	cite	13:7	8:10,12,13 10:19
character	93:9	coherence	11:19 12:13 14:6
21:2	cited	5:21	18:16 20:19 21:4
characteristics	36:8	coherent	22:9 23:9 29:1,14,18
16:14,14,16 32:23	cites	26:8 30:24	30:15,21,21 32:4,19
charts	83:21	collect	33:5,11,13,16,16
10:8	cities	17:17 38:20 39:5 41:3	34:4,10,12,13,16,21
cherry	93:22	55:4 83:1	35:16,22 37:17 48:6
66:16	citizen	collected	59:2 70:9 71:2 82:13
cherry-picked	99:5	9:12 10:11 11:1 38:22	82:21,21,22,24 83:7
morry premed		7.12 10.11 11.1 30.22	02.21,21,22,2100.7
	I	I	I

23:21 64:7 83:20 84:1 86:2,16 9:14 10:2,10 66:13 88:2 89:7,16 100:17 confusion 83:5 conceptually 101:20 102:9 103:14 compared 25:13 26:14 110:14 111:4 112:5 13:18 109:5 concern congestion commented compares 44:5 85:23 96:4 78:17 90:17 12:21 83:7 concerned connect 54:17 92:21 93:17 comparing 21:19 31:11,17,24 comments 7:14,16,20 12:4 34:17 66:22 109:2,9 concerning 63:17 71:20 38:5 46:19 62:12 comparison 95:18 connected 72:7 79:3 82:14,17 66:23 83:14 concerns 31:1 82:18 95:7 97:20 compelled 92:3 94:7,7,8 connection 98:8 105:13 116:1 concludes 18:1 19:1,5 21:20 31:4 6:4 117:5 complaints 6:1 38:2 87:13 commercial 62:3,8,10 conclusion connections 18:9 38:6 100:21 90:4,5,12 complete 31:15 Commission 16:6 25:9 26:7 35:17 conclusionary connects 46:6 70:3 72:12 88:5 119:18 83:15 9:2 commissioned 88:12 Concord consequential 23:20 completely 107:8 51:7 commit 56:5 81:4 100:19 concur conservative 86:17 100:18 101:4 114:17 9:18 10:7 20:6 70:16 commitment compliance concurred consider 87:6 100:22 101:5,10 14:7.8 14:1 16:10 94:18 11:21 101:10 compliant concurrence consideration commitments 26:6 72:2 7:21 92:8 97:2 95:24 considerations comply condition committed 72:8,10 19:7 20:10,10 57:7 59:11 33:17 40:3,17 component 68:2 considered Committee 22:16 52:17 84:11 17:6 18:20 conditions 93:20.22 94:5 comprehensive 9:7.20 15:5 18:11 consistent 7:15 15:16 32:2 74:24 19:24 21:2 22:21,24 8:1 11:4,18 12:16 13:2 common 37:14 94:6 27:20 40:9 15:17 17:9 18:13 Commonwealth compromise conduct 30:19 37:5 113:2 119:3 95:21 30:7 consists 37:3 communities computer conducted 30:14 36:7 69:24,24 30:18 37:7 9:5 88:11 constructed Community computerized confidence 68:12 2:14 30:1 36:2 94:23 construction commute concentrate confined 34:24 35:1,3,5,12 68:7 107:20 6:15 75:3 89:16,17,23 6:11 concentration 90:22 101:8,12 commuting confirm 55:16 19:2,4 9:8 116:10 construction-manag... comparable conflict 34:23 concept 106:20 109:3 26:20 27:2 88:13 26:15 110:7 consultant compare conceptual confusing 7:3,8 88:20

consultants	79:7,12 80:10	54:11 88:19 97:14	current
2:17 7:1 85:7	correct	109:23	71:23 85:1 95:10,13
contact	6:16 104:12 117:18	creates	99:1
87:2	119:7	115:7	currently
contain	corridor	credit	16:7 21:10,24 22:23
35:15	43:6 107:14	14:10,17	24:6 25:22 29:10
context	corroborate	Crest	31:24 33:24 42:24
16:9 18:4 23:24	8:9 9:8 13:1	65:5	48:21 50:2 89:7
contiguous	costs	criteria	102:10
74:22	59:12	22:12,16,18 27:18,23	curve
continuation	counsel	34:7,8	55:24
4:4	1:10 91:15	cross	curves
continue	Counsel's	25:17,21 28:11 43:22	73:12
5:4 25:17 40:17 43:7	5:4	64:12,13,14 68:22	customary
86:23 116:3,13	counted	70:2 88:7	35:1
117:18	10:1	crossed	cut
continued	countermeasures	43:24	68:13 96:21 97:13
3:1 27:4 116:4,11	13:4,21	crossing	cutting
continuing	counts	14:5 24:7,9,15,15,16	68:15
117:3	10:5,10 38:16 39:2,3	25:18 26:18,19 28:16	CVS
continuous	104:16,23	28:23 31:7 43:9,23	74:13 77:7 107:1
21:20 74:22	couple	44:4 76:18 107:3	cycle
control	13:11 49:18 69:11	crossings	43:19 64:18
15:24 17:15 22:11,14	82:1 97:20 112:16	35:20 74:14	
22:15,17,19,22 23:1	course	crosswalk	D
23:6,13 24:18,23,24	8:19 16:18 17:24 18:2	25:5 26:16,20 28:4,17	D
25:20 27:19,21 28:1	19:11 21:5 41:18	29:15 34:16 43:10,11	20:14 90:19,20,23
28:5,9,11 33:6 34:5	42:21 55:20 57:17	45:6 77:7	112:9
34:24	96:2 101:15 103:18	crosswalks	daily
controlled	108:3,21	27:12 34:18 77:9	17:17 51:12,17,19
24:20	Court	cross-sections	55:9 83:3
controls	119:2	74:3	dais
27:16 33:18 34:1	covered	cul-de	59:23
35:21 42:12	36:21	30:2	damage
convinced	covers	cul-de-sac	89:22 93:4
99:6	58:17	30:10 91:19	dangerous
cooperation	crash	cul-de-sacs	65:3,4 91:4
33:10	12:20,21 13:13,15,17	36:12 91:22 93:8,10	darkness
coordinated	15:4 18:10 23:19	93:12 111:5	92:12
7:10 56:8	24:10 39:17,18,19,19	curb	dashed
coordination	crashes	24:12 25:4,17 26:4	15:16 31:10
56:12	13:8,22 39:20 44:9	27:10 30:8 35:19	data
copy	crawling	43:19 80:21	9:4,11,13,14 10:10,11
62:13	67:11	curbside	10:16 11:2 12:14,16
corner	create	26:11 27:11	12:18 13:2,22 14:13
	I	1	ı

14:22 23:10 32:7,11	40:8,16,20 51:3 76:13	53:9 57:11 58:7,16	desire
32:19 39:3,4,17,18	decisions	61:7 73:10 78:2	33:19
39:19,19,22 41:4	72:10 93:20	90:10,11 92:3,15,22	despite
66:6,12,15,16,19	decorate	93:16 111:7,24	99:21
68:10 73:16 83:1,7	87:21	departments	destination
83:11,16,17,18,21	Dedham	5:4,20 58:5 61:7	31:2 77:15
96:12 105:7 108:13	63:24	depend	destinations
108:14 112:17,18,22	dedicated	81:6	21:21
112:23	5:12	depending	destroy
date	deemed	56:13 98:14	75:10
4:20 68:8 76:5 116:9	8:13 23:7	depends	destroying
117:9,10,12,14,15,15	defend	115:5	71:13
dated	54:24	depiction	detail
101:23 119:9	definite	13:5	13:15 29:4 34:14
dates	42:1	depo	104:4
83:22	definitely	47:22	detailed
day	117:23	Deputy	38:6
16:18 17:21,24 18:2	degradation	60:2	detection
56:3,7,13 64:9 66:11	91:8	describe	28:21 105:18
66:12,22,23 67:6,8	degree	10:23 24:2	deter
67:18 73:18 76:22	51:8 53:21	described	50:17
77:5 78:6 79:12	delay	20:4 30:22 32:24	determine
80:13 83:8,8,14	92:4,18 93:1 94:10	35:18	41:5 51:9 83:1 88:11
85:21 94:20 96:8	delivered	design	88:16
	76:2	12:3,7,8 25:8 26:6	determined
105:4,16 108:3,21,23 113:1,4 119:9	deliveries		101:16
· ·	35:6	27:3 29:16 30:2,11	
days 66:15 67:10 76:23	demand	30:12,12 33:13 35:18	develop 70:17,20
		35:24 36:5,5,7,15,15	f .
83:9,23,24	21:6,13 33:18,20 34:3 41:22 47:24 101:1	36:16,17 37:4,5,6,11	developed 18:19 25:13 27:2
day-to-day 83:13		37:13,15 43:12,17	
	demographic	44:24 45:10 46:18 62:16 75:12,16,23	development 2:14 18:8 21:16 31:14
dead	59:14,16 demonstrate		
37:3,10 63:2 dead-end	11:21	88:5,12 92:1,1,9 94:1 102:19,20 111:14,16	34:18 37:2 54:15 62:14 65:18 69:1
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
36:13 deal	demonstrated	117:2 designed	70:24 72:15,16 77:21
deal 41:17 42:20 45:2	12:23 21:13 34:2 36:2 denials	designed 106:12	78:22 87:2 89:2
			105:11 107:11
48:23 70:11 75:5,5	94:6	designer	Devices
death	dentist	63:5	22:15
93:3 94:11 decide	74:6,7,8	designing	diagram 15:14 23:24 41:2
	deny 93:11	25:9	
40:19 80:15 94:16		designs 30:3 46:22	died
decided	department 2:19 10:20 11:14		111:19 difference
117:11 decision		desirable	104:3
uccision	12:14 39:18,22 40:14	111:24	104.3
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

different	105:12 107:17	44:5,6,10,16,18	driveway
42:2,8 47:20 48:7 56:3	discusses	DOT	25:15,16,18 34:12
56:7 59:15 70:8 71:7	101:24	13:2	69:13,16 76:15 81:18
79:9 98:23 109:2	discussing	dots	81:19 113:18,20,22
differently	40:5,22 95:9	8:15 63:18	driveways
82:19 87:19	discussion	double	8:17 11:20 20:23 39:7
difficult	5:5 7:17 10:19 27:4	57:24 62:9 72:23 73:9	67:14 71:3 98:9
104:5	33:15 35:23 48:4	73:13 106:10	driveway's
difficulty	67:5 85:12 99:10	doubling	81:24
99:20	117:4	51:17	driving
direct	discussions	doubt	26:4,8 39:9 44:21
63:10 65:2	34:20	81:22	46:15 50:8 52:3,18
directing	dismal	downside	54:19 105:17 115:20
113:11	88:22	45:21 89:13	drops
direction	disperse	dozen	55:23
11:5 27:12 43:1 44:22	20:21 71:8	91:16	drop-off
46:12,13 56:15 97:13	dispersed	dozens	106:10
directions	13:9	62:3	due
52:9 88:9,15	dispersion	drainage	92:5 94:6
director	71:3	12:8 33:14	dwelling
2:14 5:2	displayed	drawing	47:9
disagree	28:15	27:3	
63:7	disruption	drive	E
disagreement	35:10	8:17,18 9:12 10:17,22	E
8:3	distance	11:1,3,24 13:9,17	20:12
disappeared	39:14 65:4,7,10 68:6	14:2 15:9 18:24	earlier
90:7	68:15 104:7,9,12	19:15 23:17,23 27:15	22:10 27:22 35:18
disaster	distances	31:13,18 32:7 35:16	113:11 117:15
73:13	67:23 68:4,11	37:23 39:4 40:1	early
discomfort	distant	42:22 43:1 48:21	105:5 107:22
46:7	63:13	52:12 53:12,15 56:10	east
discrepancies	distribution	56:21 74:3,17 88:4,8	25:14,18
86:4,7 103:15	18:17 19:20 20:19	88:14 97:21,23 98:21	Easter
discrepancy	51:14 86:2 103:13	106:20 115:18,19	105:2
40:24 47:6,10 103:13	districtwide	driven	easy
103:21	12:22	45:23 97:4	25:23 71:19
discretion	document	driver	edge
33:9	7:11,12	44:10 45:6 46:7 50:19	24:7,13
discuss	documented	52:21	edges
4:22 22:6 42:7 76:5	19:24 24:9 37:18	drivers	25:4
104:3	doing	16:5	Edith
discussed	39:2 56:19 75:10	driver's	2:11,12
23:10 29:19 30:22	98:19 102:17 113:12	51:3	education
38:16 40:6 42:10	113:18	drives	78:12
43:9 101:17 103:9	door	107:16 109:20	effect
	I	I	I

19:22 29:10 32:14	employed	12:15 27:17 30:7	et
54:22 82:7 87:11	7:24 9:9	86:22	99:8
effective	empty	ensuring	evaluate
9:15 92:17	87:12	12:4 34:16	33:21
efficiently	enacted	enter	evaluated
56:20	100:23	87:20	9:19 22:12 36:1 59:10
Eight	encompass	entering	evaluates
14:20	96:9	10:4	22:4
either	encountered	entire	evaluating
14:15 24:19,24 25:19	91:20	15:18 16:18 32:1	8:14
27:12 30:9 31:6	encourage	entrance	evaluation
42:17 45:16 50:12	49:16 53:11 54:6	12:6 62:21 69:18,21	15:1 101:22
61:7 81:17 93:1	103:1 114:21	73:23	evening
106:8 109:17 113:23	encouraged	entrances	4:3,9 7:4 12:10 58:5
116:10	53:15	34:13	58:24 59:7 81:16
elaborate	encouraging	envisions	95:4 97:23 116:1
12:10	54:11 110:20 114:22	31:23	events
electronic	endeavor	equal	64:4
29:21	35:9	71:2	everyone's
element	endorsed	equally	51:9 78:21 92:12
15:21,23 23:15 36:14	36:8	71:8	evidence
36:14 92:1,9 94:2	ends	equation	113:5
elements	31:21 43:5 79:3	49:23	evidently
15:19 16:10 18:12	enforceable-type	equipment	111:17
25:7 30:2,3 35:18	28:8	16:15 17:17 56:16	exact
36:1,1 37:15	enforced	equivalent	50:24 63:3 98:4
eleven	87:9 114:5,12	9:17 29:9	exactly
32:15 43:13,14	enforcement	especially	17:9 82:19 94:8 105:1
eliminated	53:9	67:9 105:6 107:6	108:1
71:16	engaged	Esquire	examine
eliminates	117:2	2:9,11 3:3	16:21
26:14	engineer	essence	example
emerge	7:6 8:22 42:17 63:8,8	84:20	27:7,14 28:12,19
81:5	68:8 102:4 111:13	essentially	37:10,12,16 51:13
emergencies	engineering	10:13 18:19 38:9	87:18 88:21 106:15
77:24	7:8 11:14 40:14 52:13	43:10,18 49:24 52:19	107:20 113:18
emergency	53:8 57:11	55:16 85:6,8 111:2	examples
29:18 30:17 36:20	engineering-level	establishing	36:21 93:9,11,14
52:7 58:14 77:18,20	27:3	11:15	exceed
78:14 94:10 99:23	engineers	estimated	11:24 12:1
110:22	42:19 46:19 61:10	70:15 73:18	exception
emphasis	102:2,14 111:23	estimates	16:12 42:14
67:2	enhance	14:7	excerpt
emphatically	14:2 26:22	estimation	36:11
94:5	ensure	53:11	excess
71.0	CIIGUI C	33.11	CACCOO
	I	I	I

26:18	119:18	factor	11:24 24:8,17,17
exclusion	explain	9:18 38:17	26:18 29:24 30:17
90:4,10	104:5	factored	43:10,13,22 49:18
excuse	explained	86:14	71:13 81:24 82:1
6:14 39:19	64:9	factoring	84:7,8 89:9,10,10,11
exist	expressing	9:18	89:13,14,14 98:14,15
9:7 15:17 24:10 29:10	96:5	factors	102:23,23,23,24
31:9 86:6,23 110:9	expressly	10:21 23:19 85:9	felt
existing	94:5	facts	63:5
11:17 14:23 15:13	extension	94:15,15	fewer
17:6 18:12 21:19	4:19 31:23	fair	86:10 97:9
26:16 31:8,24 32:3	extensive	111:9	field
34:1 38:16 41:10	42:21	fairly	31:4 77:3
42:13 51:12 54:8	extent	19:16 61:23	fifth
		Fall	12:3
59:16 60:16,23 72:15	8:9 22:3,7 23:7 33:18		
81:18 87:1,11,19	35:7 37:18	75:21	fight
93:17 105:21 106:13	extra	falling	92:18 94:22,24
110:23	33:23,23 54:11 96:8	44:19,20	fighters
exists	102:22 108:10	falls	92:21
25:22 68:2 90:10	extreme	99:15 107:1,19	figure
104:17	101:19	familiar	71:19 100:16
exit	extremely	26:9 56:5 61:23 88:21	figured
87:20 102:10	64:13 83:16 106:19	family	68:11
exiting	extremes	7:7	filled
87:15	67:22	far	76:23
expand	eye	44:11 46:17 63:13	final
21:5 33:16 87:1 95:13	80:12 116:9	66:11 73:7 77:6,7	5:15 45:10 76:14 91:5
expanded		106:11 111:23	finally
21:12 22:4 34:2 86:17	F	fast	26:16 34:21 46:16
expanding	\mathbf{F}	64:16 84:22	find
22:6 97:12 100:23,24	20:12	faster	11:17 61:15 68:14
expansion	face	39:9	115:11
89:5 95:9 97:14	69:7	favorable	finding
expect	facilitate	113:17	102:19
57:24 108:9,11	97:10	FDR	findings
expected	facilities	56:4	10:9 104:6
55:2 83:12 85:3 89:24	21:15 25:9 88:6	feasibility	fine
91:7	fact	88:11	80:3 81:12 84:21
	6:12 8:1 10:6 11:18	features	60.3 61.12 64.21 fine-tuned
experience 18:10 23:19 24:10	14:9 18:5 20:3,20		
	29:16 36:10 63:16	15:13 23:22 35:8	57:5
26:8 37:23 50:12	64:5,21,23 65:15	February	finish
63:9 111:11	66:4,16 72:18 80:4	66:8 109:5	49:23
expert		feel	fire
5:23 98:17 102:5	85:15,24 90:3 99:21	6:4 42:6 52:18,21	2:19 58:7,16 60:3,9
expires	101:24 102:21 109:8	feet	61:16 73:10,10 78:1

78:15 92:2,4,9,14,18	25:14	12:11	fund
92:21,22,24 93:16	focused	forward	23:6
94:22,24 111:6,24	5:5 6:17 23:17	95:2	funded
fireman	folks	found	27:9
73:11	14:3,11 26:9	14:18 49:21	funding
firm	follow	four	57:12
87:6 116:15,20	51:4 62:12 101:7	49:24 71:7 77:4 79:16	further
first	112:13 114:6	fourth	4:22 6:8,12 14:19
4:13 5:15,22 8:12	followed	11:19 21:23 40:22	25:14 39:15 43:16
38:15 60:5,10 62:23	55:1	four-lane	45:9 90:2 99:12
63:4 74:6 80:16	following	25:22	future
82:21 87:4 99:15	5:13 35:2 53:18		40:17 75:6 86:23
		four-way	105:23
100:17 103:15	follow-up	16:3 79:11,14,22,22	
Fisher	38:8 113:10	80:3 99:5	future-year
37:1,1	follow-ups	framework	9:19
fit	61:19	27:4	G
116:21	foot	frankly	gain
five	25:12 73:4	59:17	38:14 71:18,18
32:10 43:13,14 60:10	force	Frawley	
60:10 74:14 78:3,19	57:20 69:23 113:14	2:22 61:20,20	game 95:22
79:17 108:5,5,6	114:4	free	
fix	Ford	6:6 58:19	garage 12:6 106:7
110:8	61:13 62:14	freeway	
flake	foregoing	54:2	gated 69:24
99:15	119:5,7	frequency	
flashing	form	84:15	gates
24:19 25:19 45:8,12	13:23 14:11 16:4	frequently	69:22,23
45:17 46:3,9,10,13	17:15 22:19 23:1	98:1,22	gee
106:17	24:18 28:1,8 30:7	Friday	26:12
flat	93:19	105:9	Geller
10:13	formalize	friendly	2:3 4:3,6 5:11 6:16,19
flatten	24:13	71:22	47:5 57:1,4,14 58:2,8
102:7	formalized	friends	58:11,13,19,22 59:4
floor	27:11	98:22	59:6,21 60:15,22
1:11	formalizing	front	61:18 62:18 79:5
flow	25:4	94:19	82:10 91:12 96:16
25:10,11 51:6 54:1	format	full	97:17 100:3,11
82:19 86:12 97:10	29:21	27:17 30:10 34:6	109:11 110:2,14
fluctuate	former	85:16	111:4 112:14 113:8
105:16	98:19	fully	114:14 115:24
fly	forms	31:3 72:12 100:18	116:17 117:1,12,17
69:14	21:7 24:23,24	full-signal	117:21,24
flying	forth	27:19,21	general
67:15 99:2	86:1 119:6	fun	101:15
focus	forum	77:1	generate
	.	-	-

108:4,5	110:16	grading	guessing
generated	going	101:18	37:21
18:21 48:11	4:3 5:16 18:24 38:5	graphic	guest
generation	45:7,18 46:1,14	18:20 104:5 109:16	87:17
14:7 73:17,18 74:1	47:11 48:18,24,24	112:2	guy
genesis	49:2 50:4,7,11,11	graphical	46:15
14:22	51:3,8,23 53:14 55:7	13:5	40.13
gentle	55:21 57:22 60:8,9	graphics	
26:3	60:12,12,14 63:10,22	103:14	HAC
Gerry	63:24 68:14,15,21,22	Grassmere	94:18
20:15 25:15 27:19	69:4,5 71:4,5,6,9,16	49:6	half
getting	71:20,24 72:1,3,17	gravel	9:16 70:22,22 104:18
34:21 60:19 80:4	72:19,21,23 73:9,10	101:13,14	Hall
95:17 96:12 107:7	73:19 74:4,11 75:7,9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	62:1
93:17 90:12 107:7 give	75:16,24 76:12 77:12	gray-colored 69:4	halt
4:21,23 38:12 50:24	73:10,24 70:12 77:12 77:14,23 78:15 80:5		69:16
53:2 54:3,7 105:17	80:15,23 81:6,10,20	great 29:4 92:23 99:20	hammerhead
107:11	81:24 82:3,6,8,13	108:21 112:24 113:8	30:11 36:15,16 37:5
given	85:24 95:2 98:12,13	114:22	37:11,13 58:14 60:6
85:16 95:22 96:2	100:14 104:6 108:7	greatest	60:11,17 91:19
giving	109:18,22 110:6	86:12	hammerheads
4:16 59:24 105:13	113:22,23,24 114:1,8	green	91:22 111:6
4.10 39.24 103.13 glass	114:13,23 115:11,19	5:6 8:15 36:10 76:21	hammerhead-type
65:1	116:4,22	Greendale	30:3 35:24 36:15 37:4
global	Goldstein	37:12	Hammondswood
74:19	2:21 60:1,1	groceries	37:16
gloss	good	72:20 73:6 106:9	Hancock
72:18	4:3 7:4 19:20 27:14	grocery	17:7 21:9,19 29:11
	59:7 66:14,17 67:4	72:22	31:8,12,16 59:16
go 19:11 29:4 38:20	95:4 96:22	Grossman	62:21 69:21 73:21,23
41:18 48:1,24 49:1	gospel	106:24	81:19 97:5,14 99:1
50:5,10,22 52:22	46:21	Group	handle
58:8 60:11 63:22,23	gotten	7:5	51:18 52:1 75:13,16
64:1,2 65:6 66:1,2,3	26:12	Grove	78:14
73:19 74:7,10 77:3,9	grab	56:9	handled
79:4 80:9,16 81:2	72:22 77:10	growth	5:21 76:4
84:22 89:20 91:1,1	grabbing	9:9,15,17,19 10:2,2,7	hands
100:11,14 102:24	grabbing 77:5	10:13 20:5 37:18,21	58:23
103:11 107:21 108:6	gradation	37:22 38:17 70:15,22	happen
103.11 107.21 108.0	99:8	109:6	80:23 81:2,15 82:6
114:10	grade	guarantee	115:4
goal	69:14 71:24 72:4 73:4	77:12	happened
114:19	79:20 80:5 102:1,6	guess	52:3 107:13 109:7
goes	grades	15:22 52:10 68:16	happening
24:16 28:7 57:1	55:13 73:12	76:7,8 79:3 96:11	28:22
2 r.10 20.7 37.1	33.13 /3.12	70.7,0 77.3 70.11	
	l		

	1	1	1
happens	help	72:20 77:9 81:16	71:13 75:24 91:16
24:3 60:8,24 93:13	6:11 20:21	107:18	93:11
99:10	helpful	honest	Hussey
happily	116:2	114:5	2:5 4:7 52:3 53:4,17
11:22	Hi	hope	58:11,12,16 116:14
happy	96:17 97:18	95:2	116:19 117:8
47:4 49:10 79:24	hidden	hopefully	hybrid
hard	109:7	79:9 117:24	27:23
86:1	high	hoping	Hynes
harm	11:6 14:14 15:4 22:18	38:14	77:3
93:3 94:11	28:3 37:21 47:18	hotel	
haul	57:23 87:24 108:8	76:15	I
101:13	115:15	hotspot	ice
HAWK	higher	13:14	99:19
34:8 45:12,13,17,20	15:5 17:3,8,23 54:18	hour	idea
74:14	62:4 68:1 91:9	11:1,10,11 17:2,5,22	21:6 22:6 41:17 46:2
HAWKs	106:19 108:24	19:6,11,17 35:5	79:11 81:11
45:4	highest	51:16 54:17,18 55:3	identical
hawk-type	19:2,4 54:23 55:7	55:3,7,7,8,8,10,14,17	9:12 11:12
24:20 25:19 28:3	highlighted	55:17,19 56:1,1	identified
hazards	113:6	67:12,18,19 70:13	7:24 13:3 15:12
73:5	highly	81:16 85:2,5 86:10	identify
head	11:3 13:2	86:13 97:23 98:1	14:22 32:22 35:4,17
108:2	highway	107:19,23,23 113:1	identifying
headache	28:13 36:9 102:16,17	hourly	10:20 11:19 34:23
88:22	high-rise	17:17,21	ignore
heading	71:6,9,24 72:4 76:7	hours	114:7
80:24 103:24	high-volume	16:17,17 35:6 51:15	ignoring
hear	98:20	54:20 63:2 104:22	114:8
5:15,22 6:7 69:15	hill	107:24	illustrates
116:18,22	1:7 2:20 5:5 33:24	house	31:7
heard	36:24 37:1,1 59:8	64:10 66:8 72:4,22,23	immediate
6:9 93:15 97:21	65:5 76:16 86:24	73:6,8 78:2,5 92:19	4:6
hearing	95:12 103:2	houses	impact
1:5 4:4,13,19 5:12,13	hired	68:16 71:17	20:22 32:9,24 33:3
7:14,18 8:5 30:22	101:21	Housing	50:11 51:6 68:20
33:7 47:8 95:22	hit	93:20 94:5	86:11,12,15 88:16
106:15 111:15 116:4	64:23	Housings	90:1,12,13
116:5,8,10,11,13	hitting	93:21	impacted
hearings	44:9	Hubway	68:20,21
4:5,20	hold	74:23	impacts
heavy	46:17,22 116:10	hundred	8:14 65:2
64:14	holding	49:18 51:22 70:21	implement
Hello	81:21	81:24 82:1	23:4,6 33:9 34:9 46:6
38:4 62:19	home	hundreds	implementation
23.1 02.17			
	I	I	I

	ī	ī	ī
88:12	incorporate	13:20	15:23
implemented	45:11	individual	intending
27:8 28:13 48:19,19	incorporated	13:16 29:11,12 31:11	12:10
53:1	29:16	industry	intensity
implementing	increase	8:1 20:3 30:7 55:1	28:3
22:17 27:5	19:10,13,21 21:1	63:1	interaction
implying	43:21 51:8,10,20,22	inferring	44:12
50:6	54:7,22 85:4,5 86:9	95:23	interactions
important	86:10 87:13,15 103:1	information	52:11
63:15,19 64:4	increased	8:5 10:5 13:5 14:1	interchange
impossible	54:6,15 83:2 85:9	19:18 32:6 38:13,14	63:12 109:13
64:17	88:24 103:1	39:20 40:13 102:5	interesting
impression	increases	infrastructure	99:6
105:17	18:18 19:6 32:21 69:8	89:4	internal
improvement	102:21	initiatives	49:24 115:9
89:6	increasing	15:8	intersection
improvements	40:4 70:13,23 84:15	injuries	22:10 24:3,4 39:12
10:12,21 14:1 24:1	incrementally	91:10	45:15 49:17 56:11,12
35:16	46:9	input	57:18,23 62:21 63:23
inability	Independence	6:8	64:11,15,22 65:13
92:4	8:17,18 9:4,12 10:17	insecure	79:14,15 80:1,2
inapplicable	10:22,24 11:3,24	52:21	81:23 82:1 90:16,17
93:15	13:9,16 14:2 15:9	inside	98:16 99:17 104:8
inbound	18:2,24 19:12,15	77:20 79:1 97:6	107:8 109:15 110:9
104:1	20:15,23 23:17,22	install	112:5
incidence	24:5 27:15 31:13,17	42:18	intersections
12:20 68:18 79:24	32:7 34:4 35:16	installation	8:19 9:22 11:24 13:16
incident	37:23 39:4 40:1	22:13	41:16 45:16 50:1
36:4	42:22 43:1 52:12	installed	55:12 63:15 64:3
incidents	56:6,9 58:1 74:2,17	90:11	65:16 79:21 90:19,21
13:11 60:22 61:5 69:3	79:13 80:10,24 81:12	instance	110:11
include	81:13,14 88:4,8,14	9:22 10:9 14:4 15:3,21	introduce
21:14 36:22 44:14	88:18 90:24 91:1,3	16:21 19:10 20:8	6:22
88:6,8 101:9,12	97:3,21,24 98:16	21:22 23:14 31:5	intrude
116:6 117:4	99:18 106:19	instances	85:19
included	independent	14:16	invariably
8:16 39:19 110:1	107:1	instrument	92:19
including	indicate	66:7	inventoried
35:19 41:21 87:23	18:20 23:1,22 30:1	integrate	15:13
93:12	36:11	31:15	investigated
inconsequential	indicated	integrated	73:15 86:19 88:3,7
19:16 32:10,16 48:13	8:15 12:19 20:2	21:17 31:3	invite
51:7	indicates	intend	97:8
inconsistent	11:2 86:9 87:6 89:3	10:22 58:24	involve
17:13	indicating	intended	36:13

involved	3:5 96:17	77:18 78:5,15 79:20	largest
13:23 76:1 111:17	June	79:23,23 81:1,9,10	29:22 30:4 92:9
involving	117:12,16,16,17	83:9,12 88:21 93:13	Lastly
4:5	jurisdiction	93:21 99:5,13 105:9	59:19
Irene	57:20	111:18 113:7 115:13	late
3:4 95:4	37.20	117:9	95:22
irresponsible	K	knowledge	latest
81:7	keep	93:7	44:23
issuance	49:17 55:14 68:23	known	law
35:2	76:8 79:10 80:4,12	24:19 25:8 43:19	94:17
issue	94:19 100:13 116:9	knows	layout
12:4,11 15:4 29:3,3	keeping	67:12 72:20	30:9
30:15 35:23 41:6,8	89:14 97:11	Koocher	lay-down
	Ken		1 -
44:5 49:5 53:9 54:8	2:21 60:1	3:6 97:18,18	35:8
54:9,11 57:16 60:20	key	Krokidas	lead
63:4 84:24 91:19,23	78:23	2:10	6:12 21:21 66:15
92:7 103:7 104:10	kidding	Krug	114:8,23
105:21,22 106:12	100:12	2:24 79:6,6	leave
107:6 110:21,23	kids	L	36:4 73:20,22,23
111:21,21,22 115:7	64:18,19 70:2,5 85:20	lack	105:5
issued	85:21	18:10 48:12 95:24	leaves
35:14 38:7	killed	ladder	103:16,16
issues	80:4 111:17,19	92:15	leaving
4:10,22 5:12 8:3 37:8	kind	Lagrange	53:14 103:24 107:7
38:7 41:6 42:4,4	37:7 42:9 65:18 70:10	99:16	108:6
58:14 60:15 78:23	72:18 82:19 93:22	199.10 land	ledge
94:2 107:14 110:9	kinds	63:13	101:14
114:24	81:6	lane	left
it'll			4:6 63:16,24 64:5
57:4 113:14	knew	25:24 26:3,11,11,14	65:16 66:3 76:19
	39:18,23 110:12	27:10 31:6 43:6,13	81:17,19 82:2 90:23
J	111:19	43:14,14,15,24 44:4	91:2 92:19 98:11
J	know	44:7,17,18 46:12,15	110:11 113:21 114:1
1:18 2:15,16 119:2,14	10:18 14:14 15:8 30:6	74:10,11 85:8 88:9	114:3
Jay	32:24 35:14 40:5,15	88:10,10,15,24 91:3	left-hand
3:3 91:13	41:16 42:3,4,8 44:21	97:11 102:15,16,17	46:15 65:6 113:13
Jesse	45:10 46:7 47:11,12	106:18	left-turn
2:3 4:6	47:15 49:14 50:18	lanes	20:14 113:16
job	51:9 52:12 54:19	25:5 27:12 35:19	legal
51:9 75:14,14 92:23	55:24 62:5,24 63:2	42:24 43:8,18,23	43:3
join 75.1	64:8,16,21 65:1,3,20	46:13 74:4,18,20	legitimate
75:1	66:6,8,11,14,20 67:3	77:4 81:12,13,20	96:7 109:9
Jonathan	67:7 68:3,8,12 69:7	88:5,7,18 97:12	length
2:4 4:7	69:11 70:12 71:11,14	large	24:16 58:1
Joni	73:2,19 74:18,24	5:8 8:2 13:12 33:3	lengthy

91:22 93:8 111:5	link	8:16,18 9:23 10:1,12	93:1 98:8 99:14
letter	31:19	13:3 16:2 17:19	105:23 107:14 112:2
38:6,8 40:3,24 45:13	Liss	20:11 22:21 23:4	lots
48:6 52:16 55:12	2:7 4:8 51:4 52:2 61:6	28:1 34:18 35:6	70:5 87:21
100:19 101:20,23	61:17	36:22,23 57:15 71:7	low
103:15 104:4 108:16	list	86:19	12:20 17:20 18:5,7,11
letters	28:14	logical	18:13 47:24 48:13
82:14	listen	51:5	51:20
let's	6:9	long	lower
40:18 51:13 67:20	literally	24:8,8 26:18 29:24	13:19 106:24 114:21
115:17	20:9	60:19 81:18 109:23	luckily
level	little	longer	78:5
19:21 20:7,9,12,13,17	23:2 38:11,12 46:7	49:6 66:1	lucky
24:1 32:17 61:8 72:5	50:21 54:14 55:24	look	116:12
94:22 112:6,7,8,9	56:1 73:15 75:1	8:22 9:3,21 11:6 13:15	L-shaped
Levin	78:17 106:6	14:13 15:11 16:24	36:14
2:20 59:2,5,7,8	live	17:7 19:9,14,15	
Lexington	53:19 62:20 64:1 71:5	22:18 33:21 34:5	M
94:4	71:6 79:6 82:12	52:10 62:13 64:23	M
light	96:10,17 97:18	65:13,13 66:17 67:21	2:11,12
28:21 46:1 56:18,22	lived	67:23 68:1 69:21	main
64:12 65:1 82:4	79:16 97:19	74:19 75:11 77:11	106:7
99:17 107:9	lives	79:18 82:18 93:5,20	maintain
lights	63:21	94:12,21 103:11	87:21
80:15	living	112:21 113:7 114:6,7	maintained
likelihood	97:7 107:1	looked	87:9
14:11	load	15:15 16:13 61:14	major
likewise	72:20	73:16 105:14 106:1	59:11 75:22,22 77:15
26:1 31:13	loads	112:24	majority
limit	75:13	looking	84:3
10:24 11:11,12,16	local	38:13 39:24 42:23	making
16:23 17:3,5,8 39:7,8		44:6,7 49:3 67:23	30:23 54:2 73:5 81:12
39:9,13 67:4 92:1	14:23 16:22 17:20	68:1 104:14 112:3	88:14 97:8 103:17,23
limited	18:5,18 19:19 20:22	looks	malfunction
83:16 104:8,11	23:10 32:20,22 33:1	12:21 69:3	13:12
limits	35:10 36:21 41:4	loosey-goosey	management
11:4,17 17:10,13	51:2 61:7 102:19	96:1	21:6 35:2,12 75:4
18:14 84:10	108:14 113:2	losing	89:18 101:9,12,23
line	location	52:24	managing
59:22 80:23	9:13 13:13 15:4 16:1,6	loss	7:1
lined	16:8,12 20:24 22:14	71:19	mandated
60:13 65:10 80:19	22:20 24:5,9 25:20	lot	96:3
lines	32:8,8,12,14,18 34:6	43:20 44:9 53:2 62:9	maneuver
11:23 12:5 34:12	34:16 37:4 47:13	63:19 67:2,5 69:23	79:1
85:12 101:8 104:7	locations	72:18 75:9,11 87:4	maneuvering
55.12 101.0 101.7	10 CHUICH	, 2.10 /3.7,11 0/. 1	
	l	l	I

30:4 36:19 37:8	2:17 7:1 15:11 40:3	2:22 3:2,4 5:10 61:20	67:12,18,19
manual	82:21,23 83:19,21	62:2,6 65:22 76:11	million
10:9 22:14	84:20,23 85:2 86:8	76:14 82:12 95:6	70:7
manually	86:16 89:11,17 90:17	102:13 117:21,23	millions
10:1	95:8 100:9,11,18	meetings	75:23
	95.8 100.9,11,18 MDM's	61:24 76:9	mind
map 8:15	82:18,20 84:1,13	Member	62:15 68:23 76:20
Marc	86:24 88:2 91:6	2:6,7,21,22 3:2,4	112:12
2:20	Mead	61:21 62:2 82:12	mini
March	3:3	95:6	
		Members	15:21 62:1,8 minimize
7:6,12,12,14,17,23 8:5	mean		35:9
8:21 14:21 30:22	11:3 46:14 47:13	2:2 6:23 62:6 116:18	
38:6 119:18	49:14 73:24 74:14	mention	minimum
Mark	75:18,20 76:10,20	52:15 85:13 99:9	16:15 88:2 90:21
2:6 4:6 59:7	77:22 93:3,21	mentioned	minor
marked	meaning	5:11 22:10 27:22 80:8	45:2
28:16	11:16 12:21	89:21 96:24 98:7,10	minute
Marlborough	means	98:19 99:3 104:15,23	45:4 70:12
7:2	9:19 14:13 38:24	mess	minutes
Martha's	73:20 91:2 108:4	74:8	19:13 32:10 33:2 63:9
80:14	meant	met	miserable
Mass	45:13,14,15	22:13,21 42:13	99:13
62:14	measure	method	missed
Massachusetts	16:7 52:17 53:1	86:2	77:19
1:12 7:2 119:3	measured	methodologies	missing
MassDOT	11:22 12:2 16:15	7:24	31:19
12:17 27:9	17:12	methodology	mistakenly
massive	measures	83:14	45:14
109:23	10:23 15:2,7 18:14	methods	mitigate
mast	20:1 23:9,12 34:24	111:8	87:10
45:18	40:2,4,10 41:8,22	Michaud	mitigated
material	42:2 48:18 49:15	2:16 6:23,24 7:9	90:1
19:22 35:8 51:10,10	50:14 52:23 84:11,17	114:16	mitigation
75:8 104:2	84:18 86:18,23	microphone	106:23 107:11
materially	100:19,22	4:17	model
86:11	mechanical	mid	29:22
matter	17:17	9:24	modeling
7:9,15 46:5 48:14	Mechanically	midday	30:18 36:2
50:15 52:13 115:19	11:1	16:17	models
115:20	meet	middle	30:1 37:7
matters	5:4 25:8 27:23 33:7	6:5 28:17 45:1 78:1	modes
91:17	34:7,7 39:14 42:11	mid-block	25:11
MBTA	42:15,16 70:6 94:15	107:2	moment
14:16 47:23	117:20,22	miles	24:19
MDM	meeting	11:1,10,11 17:1,5	momentarily
	<u> </u>	,	ľ
	1	1	I

15:10	11:14	20:1 21:4,13 22:4	never
Monday	MUTCD	23:1 26:13 29:14,22	45:23 57:16 66:4
105:9	22:15 27:18,22	30:17 32:5 33:19,23	105:8
money		34:3,5 35:17 36:20	new
107:12	N	37:19,23 44:2,3 57:8	29:5 32:9,15 40:16
monitor	NACTO	57:13 69:10 72:5	45:21 56:16 59:15
57:7	44:23	85:10 89:2 95:21,24	70:9,10 71:12 72:16
monitoring	Nagler	96:1 101:4 102:4,21	74:8 78:11,15,21
108:22	2:9	103:3,11 112:15	81:18 85:3 87:17,17
month	name	needed	88:3,7 90:11 98:9
66:10 80:12 95:17,17	4:6,16 6:24 59:7,24	23:13 39:16 89:12	newly
months	62:19 82:11 91:13	101:1	77:21
65:22	95:4	Needham	Newton
morning	narrow	36:22 37:11	36:23 37:13 107:8,12
16:17 19:6 54:21 55:5	44:14 52:6 80:9,18,19	needs	NFPA
85:5 103:17 107:6	85:8 86:14 89:8,21	25:10 73:14 86:14	61:15
mothers	92:14	97:1	nice
77:5,10	narrowing	negotiate	25:23 26:2 69:12
motion	97:11 99:11	86:1	76:23 85:21 109:1
28:19,21	narrowly	neighbor	night
motion-activated	96:13	96:5 107:19	67:12,19 78:1,1 92:11
24:20	narrowness	neighborhood	105:20
motivating	92:5 110:14,17	8:7,24 9:7 14:24 15:3	nightmare
88:23	narrows	15:7,12,14,18 16:9	74:9 106:16
Motor	52:20	17:14,18 18:15,18	nights
12:18	national	19:5 22:22 23:11	69:11
motorist	61:8	32:1,20 33:1 35:11	nighttime
28:22	nature	40:23 49:12 53:20	16:17 78:5
motorists	21:2,9 29:21 85:13,17	59:13 63:22 64:5	nine
25:2	navigate	70:20 78:21 85:16,17	32:15
mounted	77:20 92:10 94:23	86:11 90:18 91:10,11	nobody's
28:18	near	100:1	54:19
move	34:21 39:13 45:5	neighborhoods	noncommittal
43:17	106:3	70:5 75:17	41:24 42:9
movement	nearby	neighborhood's	nonmotorized
20:14 30:10,11 36:3	53:20 79:21	104:14	25:11
114:2	nearly	neighbors	nonpeak
moving	91:20 93:6	40:19 53:8 71:5 95:19	16:17
44:11 55:14	necessarily	97:1 105:13	nonresponsive
multiday	54:2 78:24 87:14 96:7	net	83:19 91:6
11:2	necessary	71:18,18,18	non-motorized
multiple	32:16 69:19 115:16	Netter	84:16
8:18 20:20 61:24 62:7	116:8	2:11,12	non-single-occupant
72:5	need	network	14:12
municipality	13:4,21 15:6 17:14	81:8	normal
	•	•	•

15:5	observation	57:5 60:18 65:9	4:10,14,21 6:2 9:3
normally	99:4	68:17 76:7 77:2	opposite
92:16	obtain	91:15	45:9 52:9
north	12:14	oncoming	opted
19:1 25:14,15	obtained	44:20	23:4
northbound	13:6	ones	option
11:5,10	obviously	42:14,15 93:17 107:15	108:10
notably	45:24 47:19 49:10	109:10	options
39:21 40:11	54:5 61:9 82:3 103:3	one's	115:2
Notary	117:18	51:23 63:11	orange
119:2,14	occasions	one-lane	15:16
note	29:19	85:6	orange-dot
9:21 20:20 96:5 116:7	occupancy	one-month	8:23
noted	54:15	4:19	order
82:24 84:2	occupied	one-way	5:14 83:5 86:22
notes	57:9	67:8 70:4 99:14,16	100:15
100:8,14 119:8	occurs	ongoing	organization
notice	107:24	12:7 29:17 33:13	61:9 70:19
25:3 51:23 99:2	offense	34:19 101:21 102:4	original
noticed	115:13	108:22	83:19
66:9 82:16	offer	on-site	originally
notion	61:12	12:3 29:1 86:18	12:18 21:9
24:12 32:20	offered	100:24	originates
no-build	88:20	on-street	12:17
20:10 38:18	office	52:16 54:5 84:9,9	outbound
number	1:10 5:4 102:3	110:17	103:20
1:6 5:6,18 20:22 21:4	official	open	outer
40:2 54:16 62:10	100:22 101:5	4:4 8:3 44:5,6,16,17	26:11
67:4 71:2 74:1 82:17	Officials	69:12	outlyers
82:18 84:1 91:9,14	36:9	opening	13:10
95:8 101:13,15 108:1	Oh	44:10 111:2	outs
112:23	67:19	operate	35:20 74:14
numbered	OIB	20:12,16	outside
86:16	94:3 111:13	operated	4:20 43:18 44:11 45:1
numbers	okay	90:5	66:7 78:2,4 85:18
17:21 19:16 71:1	6:18 48:3 53:17 58:13	operates	outstanding
82:20	58:19,24	21:10 110:6	38:7
nuts	old	operating	overall
107:16	107:9	20:9 21:2 34:6 90:12	29:9 74:19
107.10	older	operations	overlooked
0	64:19	2:18 58:6 109:18,20	77:16
objective	Olmsted	opinion	overview
22:12 29:7 35:11	36:24	22:20 27:24 47:12,17	7:20
objectives	once	51:11 77:16 93:7	owners
25:8	6:1 26:11 35:13 52:6	opportunity	40:16,17,18
	0.1 20.11 33.13 32.0	opportunity	70.10,17,10
	l	I	I

	1	1	1
P	57:21	54:4 68:20,21 77:15	period
page	participating	87:23 89:1	9:16 10:14 11:2 13:6,8
100:21	116:1	pedestrian-activated	13:23 16:16 55:17
Pages	particular	107:3	83:10 89:24 104:17
1:2	15:7,24 22:20 27:13	peer	periods
parallel	28:19 37:9	5:19 7:12,23 8:13 32:5	19:17
98:9	particularly	116:16,17,20 117:1,5	permit
parameters	93:22	people	91:8
35:15	parties	4:9 5:17 6:9,10,10	permits
parents	4:21	14:15 21:7 26:10	35:3,13 94:6
99:20	parts	28:7 39:9 41:13,23	permitted
park	64:24 113:6	45:22,22 46:1 49:16	93:8
44:7 67:6 72:21,23	pass	49:21 50:9 52:17	permitting
73:7 97:4 105:22	80:22	53:12,13 57:17 58:23	40:13 86:22 101:2
parked	passenger	59:21 62:3,5,10	person
26:13 43:3 44:2 52:19	44:13	64:19 65:6,21 67:6	78:15 95:9,14
80:18,20 81:14 92:12	path	69:6 73:7,19,22,23	personally
110:21	42:3	75:11 78:11,11 79:4	45:2 53:15
parking	patiently	79:17 80:1 82:2	perspective
5:7 22:1 24:13 25:4	95:17	84:22 87:20 96:10,12	17:16
27:11 29:1,5,6,8,9,12	pattern	96:14 97:7 98:11	pertain
34:10 35:6,10,19	81:5	99:2 101:19 103:24	4:10
43:3,4,18 44:14 47:8	patterns	105:5,17,22 106:2,7	pertaining
47:16 52:5,16 53:1,5	19:20 37:18 61:23	108:6 111:3 113:3,14	5:12
53:19 54:5,10 59:10	86:4	114:4,6,19,20 115:1	philosophy
71:17 72:16 73:9,13	pavement	115:2,8,18,18,19,20	25:8 26:7
73:14 84:9,10 87:11	75:10,11,12,15,15	percent	phone
87:21 88:6,10 92:13	88:3	9:16,17 10:3 11:8 20:5	73:1 97:15
97:5,6,7 99:20	peak	37:19,21 38:18,19,24	photo
105:19,21 106:2,8,9	16:17 19:6,17 51:15	51:15,16,20,22 55:9	73:2
106:11,12,13 110:17	51:16 55:3,3,8,14,17	66:13 69:14 70:14,15	physically
110:19 114:18,21,23	55:17,18 85:2 86:13	70:22,22,23 71:4,9	24:21
115:7,8,9,10,11	97:23 107:19,22,23	71:23 72:1,4 73:4,12	pick
Parkway	107:24 113:13	85:4 87:13,15 99:8	99:20 112:23
19:10 32:7,13 63:12	peak-hour	101:19 102:1,6	picked
63:14 64:11,13 65:8	85:3	percentage	66:17
71:15 76:19 77:4	pedestrian	14:15	picture
96:20	13:24 23:18 24:7 25:2	percentile	45:20 73:1 113:21
part	27:23 28:5,20,23	11:7,13,22 12:2 16:24	pieces
9:23 12:8 33:14 34:14	30:21 35:20,20 43:9	17:8 67:2,3,24 68:2	60:6 61:4
34:19 40:12 44:23	45:8 46:6 76:18 91:8	105:12,15 112:20	place
65:24 74:18 75:22	106:17,22 107:2	perfect	15:19 16:11 18:8 20:1
86:21 88:17 96:23	pedestrians	49:7	54:23 64:12 76:3,22
101:2 106:23 113:3	14:4 24:11,16 25:1	perfectly	77:1 81:2 84:18
partially	39:20 43:22 46:4	80:3	106:5 119:6
	-	-	•

		I	
placement	8:8	37:16	7:1
5:7	poles	practices	prior
plan	28:18	8:2 35:12	20:7 34:5 35:3 36:21
5:9 12:8,11 23:21 28:2	police	precedent	47:7
33:14 34:13,15,23	10:19 12:13 13:6	30:13 94:12,18	prior-collected
35:2 42:17 44:13	39:18,22 78:4	Precinct	9:13
45:17 72:11 75:4	population	2:22 3:2,4 61:21 82:13	probably
76:7,8 88:3 89:18,23	11:9	95:6	15:9 42:14,16 44:12
101:12,16,20 111:16	portage	predictably	54:6 56:19,19 62:13
111:22 116:7,22	73:8	88:19	66:8 67:18 71:13
planned	portion	predicted	74:1 79:16
116:11	96:23	19:11	problem
planner	portions	prefer	52:8 60:18 89:3 99:24
93:7	81:14	45:3	105:24 110:4
planners	posed	preference	problems
92:20	59:5	48:16 49:7	103:11
		preliminary	
planning	position 26:5 61:6	75:22	proceed 16:6 79:19
2:14 5:2,3 91:17,21			
plans	positioned	prepare	proceedings
29:17 71:23 72:9 74:3	33:20	23:21	4:1 118:2 119:5
76:8,11 87:1	positions	preplanned	process
play	22:1	7:7	12:12 34:15 40:13
39:24	possibility	presence	86:22 95:18 101:3,6
playground	53:4,21 54:1 97:8	18:11	117:3
76:18	possible	present	professional
playing	49:9 95:9	5:9 112:19	27:24 63:8 92:20,20
76:24 85:18,21	posted	presentation	professionally
please	10:24 11:4,12,16,17	5:15 14:21 116:6	45:24
4:16 6:9 58:8,22 116:9	17:2,4,8,9,13 39:8,9	presented	program
plus	postings	8:6 9:11 10:6 12:15,19	21:5 59:10
102:18	116:9	16:19 68:7 83:7,18	prohibit
podium	postponed	83:23 116:22	92:2 93:11
4:17 8:10	117:14	presents	prohibiting
point	post-mounted	84:20 99:24	113:13
7:20,20 10:15,19 12:3	45:3	pretty	prohibits
13:24 29:2 31:7 32:4	potential	13:8 19:20 32:2 51:20	91:21
38:15 41:24 42:8	41:21	52:5 99:13 108:7	project
56:23 59:19 65:21	potentially	113:1	7:5 8:14 18:21 20:11
68:17 76:12 77:15,19	109:7	prevent	20:18 27:9 29:12
84:23 95:11 96:11	pounds	53:21	32:15 33:1,12 35:14
97:11,16 103:6	75:24	previously	35:15 37:1,9,11
106:11 116:6	practically	32:24 83:5	48:12 51:2 57:19
points	93:24	pre-timed	70:18,19,24 75:5,18
7:17,22 8:3 12:6 20:21	practice	107:10	75:20 76:2,21 77:2
point-by-point	30:6,12 35:1 36:5,5,7	principal	77:13,17 84:4 86:3
	,,-		,
		I	I

111:1,12,17,19 116:3	94:12 101:11	41:9	95:23,24 96:3 100:7
projections	provided	push-button	113:8
86:8	11:23 12:17 15:19	28:4	question-by-question
projects	16:7 19:18 20:21	put	5:17,22
36:19 60:16	21:18 22:1,23 25:6	41:12 48:21 49:24	queue
project's	29:20 33:7 35:7,13	53:2,10 62:11 66:10	109:23
68:12	35:13 47:8 86:20	67:2 70:1 71:16	queues
prominent	108:15	74:10,11,21 76:4	57:24
24:15 25:1 27:12	provides	90:3 99:22 103:10	quick
104:20	_		_
	17:6 18:1,4 19:20	106:2,17,22 115:11	49:8 60:1 79:10 96:18
prominently	22:15 27:4 43:20	Putterham	quickly
28:15,15	providing	91:2	26:13 52:15 92:18
promise	7:15 32:11 39:11 40:3	putting	104:23
89:22	41:8 47:12 100:24	49:5 50:3 51:1 53:13	Quincy
proof	115:6	69:7 71:3 78:11	75:21
72:11	provision	puzzling	quite
proper	21:15 34:22	65:18	26:22 97:24 98:3
26:3 34:16	provisions	P.C	
properly	60:3	2:12	R
56:17	proximate	P.E	racks
property	36:24	2:15,16	21:16
8:17 12:6 29:11,23	public	p.m	radar
40:16 87:1 93:4 99:2	4:14,19 5:20 6:7,8,15	1:9 4:2 19:17 51:16	105:18
proponent	20:16 21:21 58:24	55:3,8,9 85:3,4 118:2	radar-recorder
23:21 33:8,17,22 34:1	59:22 100:20 112:3		16:15
34:9 57:7 86:17 89:9	116:5 119:3,14	Q	radii
101:11	publication	quality	30:8
proposed	36:10,11 37:15	90:16,18	radius
11:20,23 21:9 24:3	pudding	quantified	91:24
25:14 29:5 30:24	72:11	10:18	raised
31:4,14 37:8 77:21	pull	quarter	5:18 7:22 94:8,9
84:2,4 87:2 89:1,5	60:24 74:4 103:14	10:3 18:24 25:13 27:1	random
protect	pumper	quarter-mile	66:24
57:10	92:15	81:18	range
protection	pure	question	11:6,9 86:9
43:20	29:7 92:8	6:5 18:16 30:16 34:22	ranging
protocol	purpose	48:4,8 51:5 59:1,9	17:11
7:9	32:11 74:15 84:13	60:2 80:8 94:16	rate
protocols	push	96:14 101:18 109:11	9:9,15 12:21 13:17
8:2	24:19 28:6,20 41:13	112:14 113:10,19	18:22 20:5
provide	41:23 42:2 48:7 72:3	116:14	rated
-		questions	90:19,19,20
8:5 12:10 21:20 24:12	103:9 114:11	5:18 6:3,3,11,13,15	rates
25:1 26:8 32:6,17	pushed	38:5 47:3,5 58:2,9,11	12:23 13:15 14:8
35:1 36:3 43:8 44:15	24:22 48:15	58:12,13 59:3,4	ratio
47:1 74:17 88:4	pushing	30.14,13 37.3,4	าสมบ

29:6,8,9,12 34:11	reasoning	reduce	relatively
47:16	89:12	103:7	12:20 14:14 18:12
ratios	reasons	reduced	relies
60:7 114:19	9:5 32:12 63:20 92:2	35:20	12:16
reached	rebuttal	reduces	rely
7:21 22:2	68:6	109:8 110:18,18	112:4
react	recall	reducing	relying
44:19	4:9 5:17 7:13,23	84:14 88:8,18	20:5
read	recapped	reduction	remain
82:16	20:24	85:11 103:6	18:7
ready	recaps	refer	remaining
117:3	32:13 33:3	82:22	6:3
real	recipe	reference	remark
54:21 85:23 99:5	73:13	29:7	91:5
realigned	recognize	referred	remember
26:21	59:14	89:16	97:15 100:14,15
realistic	recognized	regarding	104:24
115:4	37:15	20:19 90:2,16 91:7	remind
realize	recommend	94:2 98:9	63:7
26:11 47:14 75:12	45:16 53:16 89:9	regardless	removal
really	101:7 102:23 111:2	109:21	89:19
8:3 9:5,14 12:3,9,11	recommendation	Regina	remove
14:22 17:6 19:24	40:8 48:1,17 89:13	2:22 61:20	110:19
21:23 23:16 27:3	recommendations	Registry	rent
29:2,3 30:23 32:16	100:21	12:18	59:17
33:15 35:22 38:2,7	recommended	regular	replace
39:11 41:5,14,16,23	89:10	52:7	75:17
42:6 46:4,17,20	record	regulate	replaced
48:13 49:7 50:19,24	6:24 62:11,13 90:3	91:23 92:1 93:5	65:2 90:8
53:24 66:19 67:17,21	recorded	regulation	report
70:21 72:14,15 73:2	83:10	93:19 94:18	8:1,6 9:17 10:6,11
73:14,16 74:18 75:1		_	12:15,16 14:9 18:7
78:23 82:21 85:22	recording 66:15	regulatory 10:24 11:4,11 16:23	64:15,21 65:17 82:17
90:22 94:20 95:16,21	records	17:2,4,10 18:14 28:8	82:21 83:16,19 90:17
,	12:14 13:1	relate	,
96:4 98:8 110:20,21	12:14 13:1 rectify	29:2	Reporter 1:18 119:2
111:21 114:1,9,13	110:24	related	reporting
115:2,21			•
Realty 1:7 2:20 5:5 33:24	red 28:7 31:15 46:1 56:22	18:16 29:1,8 32:5 84:4 relates	85:2
59:8 86:24 95:12		8:12 10:15 20:14	reports 5:16 62:24
	redesign 39:24		
reason 23:3 65:3 68:10 79:23		23:10 24:10 27:16	represent 91:14
	redevelopment 106:23	29:6 30:15,23 32:19	
93:4 102:24		34:10,22 35:22	representation 54:14
reasonably	redirect	relating	
17:4	42:5	8:7	representative
	l	l	l

		1	
8:23 100:6	respectfully	revised	90:15 92:13,13 95:5
represented	63:6	37:17,20	96:20 97:8,19 98:12
91:16	respond	revisit	98:22 99:11,14
representing	60:8,10 61:5 77:23	4:10 37:24	102:10,12 103:16
5:3	100:6	right	104:10,10,15 106:18
request	responded	8:10 9:4 40:12 41:10	108:14,15,15 110:3,4
8:4 12:14 14:21 32:6	78:4,7 89:11,17	43:9 44:1 45:21	110:15 111:2
32:19 50:14 83:16	response	47:10 49:9,11,12,19	roads
110:1,13	5:24 7:15,18 9:11	54:3,13 57:3 61:1,14	18:23 19:23 21:3 48:9
requested	14:19 40:7,24 61:9	62:20 64:1,3 67:4	50:17 51:2,24 53:6
10:18 33:6 38:10,12	84:1,13 86:9,24 87:6	69:12,15 71:14,19	54:12 67:6 75:17
42:23	88:2 100:18 108:16	75:19,20 79:7 80:16	85:14 88:17 104:13
requesting	108:16 110:2	81:22 100:9,15	108:14 114:12
42:22	responser	101:16 103:18,19,23	roadway
requests	6:5	104:11 105:22	14:3 18:5 20:22 30:16
43:16	responses	109:14 110:5,5	37:3 45:19 85:19
require	7:10,11 38:2 82:15,18	113:16,23	89:7 94:23 102:20
24:21 40:10 86:21	91:7 114:17	risk	roadways
101:1	rest	78:13	16:22 17:20 41:4 47:1
required	60:12 100:16 102:12	River	84:12 91:10 94:7
14:19 36:18 90:20	restrict	75:21	102:21 113:2 115:9
95:1	113:21	road	roadway-width
requirements	restrictions	2:23,24 3:6 8:19,24	33:11
11:20 12:1 30:19 39:6	35:5 113:17	9:1 16:2,21,24 17:1,5	roadway-width-dim
39:10,15 40:9	result	17:10,11,23 18:1	30:9
requires	20:10,17 87:14 94:11	19:1,4,9,14 20:15	Road/Asheville
16:5	results	22:9 24:6,14 25:6,15	22:9
requiring	16:20 26:17 38:10	25:16,23 26:17 27:19	Road/Beverly
88:15	42:1 55:15 110:12	28:24 39:21 41:12,13	81:23
rescheduled	retained	41:14 42:10,11,15,16	Road/VFW
116:8	116:16,20	46:4,14,24 48:5,8,19	63:14 P ob
residence 61:21 87:17	return 107:23	48:20 49:3,4,6,6,10 50:3,4,8 51:13,18,18	Rob 58:6
Residences	reverse	52:4,18,19,20 53:12	Robert
1:8 4:5	100:14	53:13,19 55:6 61:21	2:16,18 6:24
resident	review	62:3,6,9,20 64:10	Robin
3:5.6	7:12,23 8:13 12:7,9	65:12,14,22 66:2,4	3:6 97:18
residential	29:17 32:5 33:14,15	67:16 68:3 69:13,14	robust
19:3 40:23 59:20 84:5	34:15,20 57:20 83:17	70:20 71:5,21,24	94:17
86:5 105:10	101:22,23 109:12	74:12 75:16 76:12,15	rock
residents	116:3,17,21 117:5	78:16 80:7,14 82:12	75:8
59:15,16 67:7 87:19	reviewer	83:4,4 84:3,5,6,6,7	rolling
91:14 112:11	5:19 63:5 117:2,2,6	85:6,8 87:12,13,16	79:18
resolved	reviewing	87:20,22 88:21 89:8	room
12:12	46:20	89:20,22 90:3,4,6,13	80:21
		, ::::,:,:,:	
	I	ı	I

rosy	Russet/Asheville	says	9:8 59:14 74:10 96:5
112:21	33:5	57:21 63:1 71:17	seconds
rotary		112:1	116:12
62:1,5,8	S	scale	section
roundabout	sac	46:23	25:17,21,22 26:1 88:8
15:22	30:3	scenario	secure
route	safe	44:17 55:11	21:15
64:1 74:5,6,8 75:21,22	39:11 64:12 92:17	scenarios	see
88:20 106:14,18	98:18	70:8	13:7,17 15:14 16:3
routes	safely	scene	20:15 25:20 27:9
35:4 76:3	89:4 94:23,24	36:4	28:14 38:22 41:2
routinely	safer	Scharf	43:11 45:7 52:11
90:14	70:3	3:4 95:4,5	55:6 57:8,12 62:6
row	safety	schedule	63:17 64:24 65:11,11
65:11	13:4 14:2 26:23 30:21	87:8	65:14,14 66:18 69:20
rules	35:22 42:4 46:6	scheduled	70:5 73:2 77:5,11
90:6	84:16 91:9 114:24	116:5 117:12	100:6 103:22 106:6
run	115:7	scheme	106:11 113:4 117:24
29:24 37:6 80:2 90:14	sake	74:19	seeing
98:9	5:21	school	17:12 55:15 100:5
running	salt	9:3 13:10 21:22 26:20	seen
53:22 56:20 76:24	99:21	54:20 68:23 69:2	45:22,23 47:18,23
rush	sampling	71:15 78:12 83:23	48:1 71:23 75:13,15
54:18 81:16 98:1	66:21	85:17 87:24 88:1	100:20
Russet	Samuel	104:16,22,24 105:3,5	sees
87:12	2:9	108:7 109:1	28:22
Russett	sand	science	segments
2:24 8:20,24 16:2,8,21	99:21	63:3	75:1
16:24 17:1,19 19:1,9	satellite	scooters	selection
22:9 23:8 33:2 41:13	72:16,19 73:14 105:21	85:18	83:12
41:23 42:11,15 48:5	satisfaction	screech	Selectman
48:14,19,21 49:3	100:1	69:16	60:1
50:3,8 51:13,17,18	satisfied	screen	Selectmen
52:4 53:12 55:6	40:7 58:14,17 60:2,7	69:1	2:21
61:21 63:14 64:1	satisfies	se	semicircular
65:12 67:6 79:7,7,12	30:17	29:4	36:14
79:13 80:7 81:23	Saturday	season	sends
82:12 83:4,17 84:5,7	99:3	104:16	103:19
85:1,14 86:12,14	saw	seasonality	senior
87:16,22 89:20 90:2	45:20 68:5 70:21	109:8	7:5
90:4,6,13,15 95:5	100:8	second	sense
96:20 98:10,11,17,21	saying	21:14 87:6 98:7	15:9 19:21 27:5,15
99:11,17 104:10	6:11 49:11 55:22	secondary	43:7 49:23 52:8
108:14 110:3,4,15	70:14 72:8,9 103:23	28:10	56:18 67:21 70:18
113:12	109:15	secondly	71:8 76:13
	I	I	ı

		1	
separate	68:19	shuttles	34:6 56:2,6 107:3
88:4,6	Sherman	95:10	signal-warrant
separately	24:4 34:4 39:21	shuttling	27:18
43:24	shining	40:4	signed
September	88:20	side	40:12 86:21 101:2
83:8 108:23 109:2,4,9	shopping	25:6 27:11 28:6 31:14	significant
series	108:7	45:5,5 46:3,10,14	51:21 96:22
16:3	short	47:18 53:5,10,13,19	significantly
serious	45:5 111:1	59:23 78:18 80:20	43:15 62:4 96:21
77:14	shortened	91:1 98:12,12,14	signs
seriously	25:18	102:1 106:18 110:19	28:15 41:15,17 49:14
95:2	shortening	sided	49:19 50:9 53:10
serve	25:5 43:21	93:24 94:1	85:15 114:6,6
91:15	Shortens	sides	similar
serves	26:22	52:5 53:22 80:18 84:9	19:16 79:9 106:21
31:12 32:1	shorter	92:12	similarities
service	24:15 43:8,11,15	sidewalk	106:16
20:7,12,13,17 21:10	shorthand	15:15 21:19,21 31:6,8	similarity
21:11,12,24,24 40:5	119:8	31:16,17,21,23,24	106:21
40:20 61:1 78:13	shot	44:20 71:14,14,21	simple
90:15 100:23 112:6,7	111:12	sidewalks	103:9
112:8,9	shoulders	15:17 21:18 30:23	simply
services	88:5	31:3,11 32:3 71:11	22:18 27:20 34:6
33:17 95:10,13	shoveling	71:12,21 95:11,14	single
serving	66:9	sideways	25:24 26:3 27:11
8:17	show	36:16	30:11 36:3 37:3
session	10:3 39:23 58:23	sign	76:22 83:8,8,14 85:8
109:1	76:11 95:8 105:19	28:17 41:19 49:14	88:15,24 91:20 92:5
sessions	showed	50:3,6,7,10 69:17	92:9 93:6
4:24	46:18 112:2	79:18,19 90:7,11	single-access
set	showing	106:22	94:2,7
55:13 65:10 119:6	10:12 43:2 113:21	signage	sit
sets	shown	43:4	50:20 95:16 116:12
29:16	15:15 31:14 45:17	signal	site
setting	109:6	9:24 25:16,23 26:1,2	5:9 11:23 12:5,8,11
15:18 109:16,17	shows	26:12 27:17 28:7	14:12 33:14 34:12,13
settings	19:5,18 20:8 23:24	34:4 45:21 50:22	34:15 35:7 39:13
48:2	32:1 37:7 38:23	55:13 57:1,9 64:17	46:16,19,24 47:1,21
seven	52:14	74:12 80:16 98:15	65:4,7 67:23 68:4,6
62:22	shut	104:9 107:13,15	68:11,14 79:1 84:3
seventh	97:15	109:14,18,20	85:12 86:20 89:8,20
14:6	shuttle	signalized	92:17 93:2,2 101:13
severity	14:16 21:10,12 33:16	8:16 32:14 64:15	101:16,18,20,22
84:15	34:1 40:20 87:8	104:8	102:3,11 103:17
shaded	95:13 100:23	signals	104:7,9,11 106:1,24
	ı	1	ı

109:15 111:14,16,22	67:9 96:22	speak	105:19
sites	soccer	4:14,15,17,17 6:19	spillover
69:22	76:24	24:18 58:5,24 59:22	59:12
site-distance	solve	59:23 100:4 102:5	spoken
110:9	41:7 50:7	speaker	91:14
site-line	solves	98:19	sporadically
11:20	103:10	speaking	43:1
site-plan	somebody	91:18	spot
29:3	43:3 80:15,20	special	44:3,3
site-plan/drainage	somebody's	91:15	spring
34:20	81:1	specific	22:5,7 33:22,22 105:2
situation	someone's	9:21 12:7 13:3,13	stable
104:17,19,19,21 114:2	48:20 78:16 113:22	18:17 22:16 33:12	10:13
situations	somewhat	34:17,17,23 83:22	Staff
67:17 94:11 105:10	26:17	87:7 96:13 105:10	5:3
sixth	soon	specifically	stamping
12:13	73:3	8:7 46:11 47:18 55:13	42:17
size	sorry	82:13 102:20 111:12	standard
5:6,8 66:21	60:5 116:19	113:19	14:10,18 30:6 37:6
sleep	sort	speed	46:21 61:10 90:21
69:12	47:14,15 82:5	9:6 10:24 11:3,9,13,13	
slide	sorts	11:15,16 12:2 16:13	112:1,9
95:8,8,12	15:22	16:14,16,23 17:2	standards
slides	south	19:24 32:23 39:3,4,7	20:3 26:7 33:11 46:17
55:2,16 108:19	1:8 3:5 4:5 8:24 9:22	39:8,9,13 41:4 42:4	55:1 63:1,3 112:3,12
slightly	15:22 16:3 17:7,22	49:22 50:22 66:6,12	stands
11:10 17:3 23:18	19:2,13,15 41:11,18	67:4 69:21 103:1	21:5
slope	41:19,24 42:14 48:14	105:12,16 108:13	Stantec
102:2	48:17 49:1,2,8 50:5	110:20 111:3	102:3
slow	50:10,11,18,21 56:6	speeding	start
15:24 52:21 105:18	56:10 62:1 63:11,12	15:4 41:6 103:2	4:15 59:23 68:15
slower	63:19,23 64:2,11	speeds	started
84:14	65:7 77:6 84:6,8	10:17,21 11:7,8,18,22	4:12 6:21
small	96:18,20 104:8	14:23 17:1,9,12	state
46:23 66:22 84:22,24	109:12,21,24 113:14	18:13,13 23:19 39:12	11:15 28:13 36:9 61:8
85:6	southbound	54:6 67:3,24 68:1	61:11
smaller	11:5,11	84:14 102:22 105:19	stated
19:14 64:18	space	110:18	20:6 86:16 92:3
smoke	5:6 76:21 92:13 115:9	speed-data	statement
93:1	115:17	66:7	29:7 34:5 61:11 111:9
snapshot	spaces	spend	statements
16:19 27:14	29:5,10 33:19 43:4	63:2	83:15
snow	47:9 72:17,19,19	spent	states
66:9 99:11,14	87:11 106:4 115:11	63:9	61:15 84:13
snowbanks	115:14	spike	statewide
MIO W MILLING	110,11	Shire	Sourchide
	I	I	I

12:22 13:18	storms	59:17	sufficient
statistic	99:19	stuck	36:3 91:24
63:1	stormwater	78:19,20,21	suggest
stay	101:22	studied	13:3 15:6 17:14 19:24
46:24 58:20	street	9:23 57:14 63:15	98:5 109:17
steel	1:11 3:5 8:24 9:1,1,22	65:23 66:4 71:10	suggested
75:24	15:23 17:3,7,22	79:2 83:24	8:22 21:4 27:1 29:14
steep	18:15 19:13 21:1	studies	35:17 53:5 111:5,6
102:6	23:11 27:7 28:6	83:22	suggesting
Steinfeld	31:12 41:11,18,19,24	study	13:20 27:15 88:14
2:13 4:23 5:1,2	42:14 48:15,17,21	8:12 9:10 12:19,20	94:16
step	49:1,2,8 50:5,10,11	38:16 52:13 55:1,15	suggestion
8:8	50:18,21 56:6,9,11	57:12,15,17 63:5,6	83:11 88:23 112:16
Steve	56:12 60:13 62:1	63:16 64:6 65:19,20	suggests
3:2 82:11	63:11,23 64:2,11	67:20 76:20 83:2	16:9 37:19 93:8
Steven	65:7 66:3 67:13	86:6 96:6,24 97:22	suited
2:24 79:6	68:22 70:2 77:4,6	104:6 107:5 110:1,12	48:10
stick	78:18 80:9,18 84:6,8	116:16	summaries
40:10 62:24	86:1,5 96:10,18,20	studying	112:21
stone	104:8 105:20 109:22	110:13	summarized
89:19 98:6	109:24 110:19,22	stuff	108:19
stone's	113:15	68:7 73:9 85:12	summer
65:17	streets	subdivisions	104:20
stop	9:8 14:24 15:8,12,14	94:3	Sunday
16:6 22:10,14,22 23:6	16:20 17:14,18 18:6	subject	99:3
23:13 24:22 28:7	18:7,19 19:5,8 20:16	12:7 33:15	supplemental
33:5 40:19 41:15,17	20:22 25:9 27:11	subjective	8:5 9:4 10:16 14:21
41:19 42:10,12 46:1	32:20,22 33:1 35:11	23:3	23:12 28:16
46:2 49:13,14,19,21	36:13 41:9 67:15	subjectively	supply
49:22 50:3,6,7,9,10	75:10 78:13 81:8	34:11	22:7 34:10 101:1
51:1 69:17,23 70:3	84:5,19,22,24 86:5	submitted	114:23
79:11,14,15,18,18,19	88:5,12 103:7,8	7:11 38:1	support
79:22 80:3 85:15	Street's	subsequent	10:8 89:4
87:24 99:6,7	26:7 35:18	8:4	supposed
stopping	Street/VFW	substantial	46:8 100:9
49:17 50:3,15 80:13	63:12,19 109:12	21:17 29:24 84:21	supposedly
82:2 85:15	stretch	85:1,7 98:4	80:5
stopping-site-distance	24:6	suburban	sure
39:6,10,14	strict	14:10,18 18:22	30:23 38:9,19 39:8
stops	70:6	suburban/urban	40:11 47:2 52:24
16:4 50:12 79:22	striping	47:14	59:6 70:2 72:12 76:2
stop-control	88:3	success	76:3 78:2 100:20
42:11	strongly	46:10	105:15 108:1
storage	42:7	sudden	surprise
86:19 87:7 100:24	structure	50:4 57:24 109:23	17:19
	•	•	•

surprising	takes	testimony	94:21
66:5	54:23 61:3 78:15	20:7 36:21 47:7 95:14	third
survey	92:16	thank	10:15 21:17 87:10
23:17	Talerman	5:1,10,11 6:17,23 47:5	
suspended	3:3 91:13,13 111:7,9	48:3 52:2 56:24 58:2	Thornton
118:2	111:10	58:3,19 59:21 61:17	19:15 24:4
suspicion	talk	61:18,19 62:16,18	Thornton/Sherman
96:6	15:10 38:11 63:4	79:4,5 82:9,10 91:11	27:20
sustain	65:19 67:1 68:18,19	91:12 95:3 96:15,16	thought
32:9	69:9 71:2 74:2,3	97:17 100:2,3 113:8	43:6 53:18
SUV	75:3 76:6 77:22 87:4	115:23,24,24 117:8	thoughts
80:20	96:19	118:1	113:12
switchbacks	talked	that'd	thousand
72:5	63:11 65:20 73:17	53:7	51:23
switched	talking	they'd	thousands
104:2	47:3 63:10 68:24	50:20	75:7
synchronization	92:24 97:22 98:14	thing	three
57:2	103:4,5	48:8,9 52:20 53:11	50:15 71:7 74:14 79:8
system	TDM	65:24 67:1 68:5 70:9	85:20 92:16 95:1
15:17 18:15 21:17,19	21:5,5,6 40:2,4,10,12	79:2 80:7 81:11	96:18
23:11 28:3,12 31:3	40:17 86:18,21,22	82:16 96:1 98:7,18	three-year
31:12,24 32:2 34:8	87:1,7 100:18,22	99:9 103:3 113:4	13:8
45:18,20 74:17,24	101:2	114:18	thrilled
94:24	technology	things	105:4
systems	60:17	21:8 38:11 42:8 72:14	throw
8:24 9:24 15:15 21:21	tedious	73:8 75:18 76:17	65:17
31:8,16,17 74:14	108:17	79:8 85:22 93:5 96:2	Thursday
	tell	96:18 102:7	105:4
T	62:2 91:18 98:1,23	think	ticket
Т	99:12 110:6	5:20 17:21 29:8 47:11	114:9
107:20	ten	48:6 50:6 51:4,6	tied
table	69:3 108:4,11	53:21 54:16 58:16,17	
50:23 68:18	tend	59:17 61:13 62:14,15	ties
tables	113:3	64:8 65:21,23 69:20	60:19
10:8	term	72:10 73:14,17 77:19	time
tailored	40:11	78:22 79:1 80:11	9:15 24:14 44:19 47:5
96:13	terminal	81:2,4,5,7,9 82:20	60:6,19 61:4 64:23
take	31:22	83:10 85:22 93:14,19	65:20 72:24 73:12
6:7 7:19 14:10,15 53:2	terms	95:16 97:1 99:23,24	77:8 79:4 89:24 90:5
54:3,8 63:24 64:3	58:14 97:20,21 98:4	101:19 104:13	90:8 100:5 111:15
66:3 73:2 75:6 92:7	99:10,23 113:9,11	107:13 109:10	115:13 119:6
95:1 98:11	terrible	110:24 114:21 116:3	times
taken	106:15 107:10	thinking	13:19 56:3 65:2 79:12
14:17 25:7 26:24 97:1	testifying	74:24	79:15,17 98:20 112:2
119:5,8	95:15	thinks	112:16 113:13
	I	I	l

timing	43:19	46:20	70:11 73:6,18,20
57:9	traditional	train	85:3 87:8 89:23 96:8
timings	30:10	64:9	108:4,5,5,6
55:13 56:7	traffic	transcript	trip-generates
today	4:11 5:13 6:15,16,17	119:7	107:17
26:9 31:19,20 45:14	7:3,8 8:1 9:6,10,16	transition	truck
48:6 52:4 61:14	10:6,10,22 12:15,16	25:21,24 26:3	29:23 35:4,4 60:9,11
76:23 100:20	14:9,20 15:1,19,23	transitions	89:18,23 90:2,4
today's	15:24 16:5,11 17:18	26:4	92:15,15,16
40:24	18:5,6,11,12,18	transport	truckloads
tone	22:15 23:9,14,16	73:8	75:24 89:19
95:22	24:18 27:16 28:8	transportation	trucks
tonight	29:3 32:21 35:10	2:17 7:1 21:6,8 25:11	60:4,20 61:2,3 75:9
6:16 73:17 91:18	38:15,16,20,24 40:22	36:9 47:23,23 108:10	78:19 89:21 92:17
94:17 100:7 111:18		111:20 112:1	
	41:3,4,6,8,11,12,22 41:22 42:1,3,20,24	111:20 112:1 travel	101:13,15 truck's
tonight's			78:19
5:11 33:15	44:21 45:21 46:17	10:17 11:3,7 18:13	
top	48:5,7,10,11,18,22	19:22 23:18 27:12	true
108:1	49:20 50:21 51:18,24	31:6 35:4 43:6,14,14	119:7
topics	52:7,7,17,23 53:2	43:23 46:12,12 53:14	try
5:21	54:1,7 55:1,4,14 56:2	79:12 84:4,10 86:4	41:23 55:14 62:24
total	56:5,14,18 57:8,8,22	88:4,9 102:15 105:19	65:13 70:7 76:13
10:3 51:17 55:9 74:9	61:23 63:2,11,21	113:13	79:10 92:22 100:13
totally	64:13 65:1,21 66:1	traveling	trying
69:20 77:16	66:21 67:8 69:9,10	11:8 14:3 26:2,10 51:2	14:22 44:24 54:9 58:1
tower	69:19,22,22 70:4,13	56:9	65:6 68:22 69:6,8
29:23 87:18	71:4,9 74:5,9,12	travels	80:11 100:13 112:11
town	75:23 76:9,11 80:23	11:9	115:4
1:10 2:22 3:2,4 4:18	81:4,8,16,21 82:3,4,7	treat	Tuesday
5:4,20 9:22 10:11	83:1,2,3,5,13,21 84:4	79:13	105:6
15:20 23:3,5,7 27:5	84:10,13,17,21 85:1	tree	turn
29:17 30:20 33:10	85:7,9,10,11 86:8,11	66:7	60:7 65:6 74:5 81:17
37:2 42:6,19 46:5	87:15 88:17,19 89:1	trees	81:19,21 82:2 91:2
57:10,10 58:5 61:14	89:3,16,18 90:2,6,9	65:8,10,11,15 68:13	98:11 104:11
61:20,24 62:1,6	90:11,16 91:3,7,8	78:17 80:19	turning
82:12 83:6 86:21	96:6,23 97:10,20,22	trends	64:4 70:14 91:24
91:7,15,20 93:6 95:6	98:13,15,17,24,24	10:2,2	96:19 98:12,13
101:1 110:24 114:9	101:21 102:14,18	trip	turns
towns	103:5,5,6,7,10 104:9	14:6 18:17,22 20:19	61:16 90:23 113:13,21
76:1 90:20 91:16,17	104:16 105:4,8 107:4	51:14 70:12 73:17,18	114:3
93:11,12,22,24 94:1	108:22 111:13,15,21	74:1 86:2 103:13	twice
111:8	113:11 114:11	107:21	37:22 74:7
Town's	traffic-timing	trips	two
7:8 8:21	57:12	17:21,24 18:21 19:7	9:5 20:22 22:1 24:23
track	traffic-wise	32:16 51:19 70:9,10	33:2 39:6 42:24
	ı	ı	I

43:23 46:12 52:6 117:1 67:5 70:19 87:18 30:5 32:15 33:2 65:2 55:2 56:5 59:20 64:4 undertook 108:11,23 113:18,20 90:5 92:9,10 108:4 59:11 vehicles 65:15 67:17 73:20 useful unfortunate 32:11 12:18 17:22 22:2 79:8 80:22 81:12,13 81:20 87:5 88:17 117:6 users 24:21 33:19 36:20 93:23 94:1 95:6 unfortunately 84:16 42:2,5 45:1 48:17 112:4 97:12 104:13,20 51:14 55:6,10 58:15 uses 106:4 110:21 115:3 unhappy 9:17 77:19,20 78:8,14 115:14.22 87:14,19,22 90:12,15 62:10 usually two-hour Uniform 101:6 113:16 94:10 95:1 99:23 55:18,20 98:5 22:15 utilize 103:17,23 109:19,19 two-lane 60:17 109:22,22 110:20,22 unimpaired 25:24 12:5 vehicular U-turn unimpeded 113:24 25:10 two-way 34:13 81:15 85:6 102:18 vein \mathbf{V} unit 10:20 type vacation 16:4,7 22:17 26:6 47:9.24 59:20 71:22 verbal 7:7 96:8 104:24 105:3 7:17 32:4 28:10 29:22 30:5 106:4,7 107:18 108:3 105:6.8 108:5 115:15,18 types versus vague 15:6 23:22 36:12,19 United 94:3,4 41:1 89:22 typically 61:15 VFW valid 11:13 33:21 49:20 units 19:10 32:6,13 57:18 10:8 13:24 20:4 37:24 5:7 19:3,4 31:11 51:5 108:23 58:1 64:11,13 65:8 83:14 T-type 78:3 84:2 71:14 76:19 77:4 value 36:15,16 37:10,13 universal 79:7 96:19 97:24 32:11 93:6 98:22 103:18,19 U van 104:1 109:20,24 unloading ultimately 87:8 73:5 VI 31:13 85:23 variability unpredictable 1:1 unable 19:19 85:22 Vican 61:4 variation update 1:18 119:2,14 unaccountably 83:13 4:23 view 90:7 variations updated 114:22 unadjusted 81:6 56:20 village 14:18 varied 17:7 21:10,20 29:11 upgrade unclear 56:2 107:12 31:8,12,16 59:16 81:4 96:11 various upgraded 62:22 69:22 73:21.23 4:22 36:12,18 uncommon 9:23 81:20 97:6,14 99:1 26:10 Varol upheld Vinevard 2:23 62:19,19 undergoing 80:14 94:6 34:15 vary urban virtually 17:1 understand 102:19 62:2 vehicle 5:16 9:6 18:4 22:3 visibility use 51:8 60:16 116:14,19 13:12 14:12 17:20 25:1 54:5 96:21 11:15 14:11,16 21:7 understanding 19:7,12 29:18,22,24 26:19 36:20 51:13 visit

		1	1
98:22	76:5,10 77:9 79:8	117:6	7:9,10,16 9:3,5,18,19
visual	81:11 90:3 95:11	ways	10:5 14:7,17 15:13
45:6	98:11 100:5,11	20:16 36:18 81:13	15:15 16:13 17:16
volume	102:17 103:8,13	104:20 110:17	18:19 19:18 20:4,6
1:1 10:4 17:16,20,23	114:10,14 115:12,24	wear	20:24 22:11 23:9
18:5,7,11,18 22:21	wanted	67:22	27:1,17 29:19,19,24
23:2 24:5 27:20	27:16 38:19 39:3,4,8	weather	32:23 36:1,21 47:23
32:22 33:7 41:3 54:7	39:17 85:13 99:9	109:1	47:24
54:11,18,23 56:14	wanting	web	wheelchair
57:23 62:4,9 83:1,3	42:7 47:11	103:8	72:3
83:13 85:2,10 88:24	wants	Wednesday	wide
103:7 106:18,19	42:18 100:4	105:3,6	60:14 73:4 84:7,8
107:4 108:13 109:19	Ward	week	102:21
volumes	2:18 58:6,6,9,20 60:2	99:4 104:24 105:5,8	widened
14:23 15:5 17:18 18:5	60:5,18,24 61:13	weekday	89:10
20:4 22:18 27:21	Ward's	19:6,17	widening
33:4 38:15,21 39:1	62:12	weekdays	89:14
51:12,20 55:4,5 57:8	warrant	83:23	wider
83:2,5 105:8 108:18	22:13,19 27:21 42:15	weekends	97:9
109:2,8	warranted	98:20,24	width
volume-based	18:15 22:8 27:6,17	weigh	30:16 53:14 84:10
22:16	84:18	115:2,3	85:8 86:14 89:7
22.10	warrants	Wellesley	102:11,15,22
$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$	33:8,18 34:7 42:12,16	88:20 106:14 107:7	widths
wait	45:13	well-utilized	102:17
61:1 68:9,10	Washington	21:11	wife's
walk	1:11	went	56:23
14:15 31:5 64:8,9,10	wasn't	9:24 38:9 73:1,3	William
64:17,18,23 106:8	47:7 56:19 64:14	weren't	2:23 62:19
walked	73:16 96:24 105:7	8:2 108:15	willing
77:8 107:20	111:14,17	west	22:6 23:5 33:9 34:9
walking	watched	25:15 113:20	48:20
31:20 87:23	79:17	we'll	window
walkways	Watertown	5:23 6:7 8:8 10:23	55:20 98:5
72:2 99:22	47:21	11:7 15:10 24:18	windows
Waltham	way	39:21 75:5,6 116:11	47:20 55:18 69:12
94:4	31:1 38:17 41:23	we're	winter
want	44:16 45:9 46:1 49:1	7:2 10:12 12:9 17:12	65:22 67:9 92:11
28:5 38:11 40:11	50:12,24 52:9,22	27:14 34:21 37:20	99:12,13
41:17 46:5,6,8 48:22	53:15 57:10,10 59:1	41:14,24 42:9,23	wish
48:23 50:5 52:15	64:19 65:8,23 71:15	44:8 55:22 60:7,18	4:16
54:24 56:21 57:15	72:2,23 77:7 81:1	61:1 63:10 68:24	wishes
59:22 62:11 65:19	92:17 94:24 98:23	69:7,8 75:23 92:21	4:15 8:9
66:17 67:1 68:3,17	104:12,15,21 110:8	95:17 102:19	wonder
68:23 69:7 74:2,23	113:14 114:10,10,11	we've	80:22 81:15
	I	I	1

T			
wonderful	wrong	24:2 46:24	120
80:19	56:19 69:20 78:16	Zuroff	70:23
wonderfully	wrote	2:6 4:7 53:18 54:13	128
110:7	100:13 109:10	56:2,24 117:20,22	107:7
wondering		30.2,21117.20,22	13
53:23,24	Y	0	13:7 22:9
Woods	yards	02445	14
94:4	69:17 72:21 74:21,21	1:12	13:22 23:9
word	75:8		13.22 23.9 14th
48:12	yeah	1	4:20
wordy	47:13 71:3,6 75:4	1	14,000
104:4	92:23,23 110:4,16	9:17 19:12 20:5 29:15	18:3
work	113:9	47:24 64:1 66:13	140
23:5 41:20 42:2,21	year	70:15 82:22	87:11
45:24 52:23 59:1	10:3 13:7 37:19 38:24	1,600	15
73:19 75:14 81:10	63:2 70:15 74:7	18:2	74:13 88:2 99:15
107:21,22 108:7	79:17 96:23 104:18	1-119	16
111:22 114:4	years	1:2	2:22 3:2,4 61:21 74:5
worked	9:13 15:20 27:8 37:14	1.4	74:6,8 82:13 88:20
91:21 107:5	38:21 61:22 62:22	29:8 48:2 106:6	95:6 106:14,18 107:6
worker-vehicle	63:9 69:3 70:17,21	114:19,24	16th
35:6	70:23 79:16 90:7	1.42	119:9
	93:23 97:19 99:19	29:13	167
working 61:13 75:20 102:3	102:14 109:3	1.5	87:12
works	yellow	48:1,2 106:6	17
42:3,5 53:20 56:12	45:12 46:3	1.7	29:1
72:13	Y-type	73:18 107:18,18,24	18
worn	36:16 37:5,6	1.78	29:14 89:9 103:17,21
77:10		29:6,13 34:11 47:8,15	104:1 109:17,19,22
worried	Z	59:10 72:17	104.1 109.17,19,22
114:8	ZBA	10	29:18
	7:14	51:15,16 55:9 67:17	192
worry 38:4 75:6	ZBA's	71:23 72:1,4 73:12	87:17
worse	5:19 7:8	86:10,16 101:19	07.17
67:10 77:12 89:3	Zipcar	102:1,6	2
107:5	21:23,24 22:1,3,4,6	11	$\overline{2}$
worst	33:16,18 40:5 87:2,5	71:2	19:12 29:15 66:13
44:17 55:11,16 113:6	95:14 100:24	11:00	67:11 82:21,24
wouldn't	Zipcars	54:21	2nd
53:15 105:3 107:22	86:18 95:11	12	101:24
108:9,11 111:1	zone	13:7,17 21:4 95:8	2,700
117:15	11:16 44:14	102:18,18 119:18	17:24
written	zoning	12-feet	2-year-old
7:11,16 32:5 40:15	1:5 30:19 59:19 91:17	102:17	77:8
70:7 98:6	91:21 115:14	12-foot	2:30
70.7 70.0	zoom	102:15	
	1	1	l

54:19	33:5 89:10,13,14	32	43:10
20		35:16 43:13	490
17:5 30:15 73:4	102:13,18,24 24-hour		51:14
		33	31:14
102:23	16:16	35:22	5
20th	25	333	5
7:12,17 38:6 116:6	33:11 84:8 89:7	1:11	19:14
117:4,9,14,19,20,21	26	34	5th
117:22 118:1	8:21 14:21 33:16	11:5 17:10 19:7,12	
20,000-foot	26th	37:17 38:5 55:6,8	117:12,16,16,17,19,22 50
24:1	7:14 8:5 30:22	85:3	
200	262	345	24:8,17 26:18 67:18
72:21	82:12	29:5	69:17 85:2
2000s	27	35	500
9:24	17:3,11 34:4	11:1,11 17:8,10 84:7	11:24 17:20
2004	28	37	55
10:11 56:4 83:21	17:3 34:10	97:19	102:17
2007	29	38	58
9:14 38:23 66:11,22	17:11 34:12	24:17 63:2	13:19
83:3,8 109:4		39	6
2011	3	11:10	$\left \frac{0}{6} \right $
13:6	3	4	68:18
2013	13:19,23 40:2 103:22	4	
10:10 83:22	103:24 104:2 109:17	4:00	6th
20130094	109:19,22	54:20 55:5 97:23 98:2	1:11
1:6	3A	40	6:00
2014	75:21	55:21 70:10,11 86:10	55:5 97:23
1:9 4:21 9:11,15 38:23	3-year	86:13	60
66:12,23 83:9 109:5	13:23	40B	17:22 70:13,17,23
119:9	3:15	1:7	85:4
2021	98:2	400	65
119:18	3:30	98:14	85:2
21	98:2	41	7
17:1,5 30:21 102:23	30	55:22	
22	11:6 34:16 67:20	42	7-year
30:16 32:4 43:22 63:9	86:13 116:12	29:23	10:14
89:10,11,14 102:23	30-mile	43	7:00
22-vehicle	17:10	51:14 55:10,20 85:4	1:9 55:4,18,21 67:12
19:10	30-mile-an-hour	96:8	7:06
23	16:22	430	4:2
17:1 32:19	300	51:19	7:15
230	74:21,21	45	55:19
98:15	300-yard	2:23 62:20	70
237	76:15	46	71:4,8
2:24 79:6	31	61:21	75
24	34:22 89:16	48	71:4
	I	1	I

	1	1	
8			
8			
1:9 69:14 73:4 84:1			
99:8			
8:00			
55:21,22			
8:15			
55:19			
80			
72:22			
84			
87:13,14			
85			
11:8			
85th 11:7,13,21 12:1 16:24			
17:8,11 67:2,3,24 68:1 105:12,15			
112:20			
112.20			
9			
9			
18:16 19:15 70:9 86:2			
9:00			
55:4,18,22			
9:34			
118:2			
90-degree			
26:21			
99			
85:5			
	l		